



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, May
12, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, open to us, we pray Thee, the gates of the morning as at noontide we bow here at this wayside shrine of Thy grace, for these are troublous times; the margin of our inner strength seems often perilously low. We stand in dire need of courage and fortitude and stability. Grant us now the grace of a quiet heart and a humble mind. For the preservation of liberty, for the defeat of all tyranny, for the opportunity still to be free souls, for the redemption of democracy from its failures, for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in all the earth, we lift our hearts to Thee, O God of our salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 20, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TO HEAR ADDRESS BY GENERAL RIDGWAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that Members of the Senate are invited to attend a joint meeting with Members of the House of Representatives at 12:30 o'clock p. m. tomorrow to hear Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway address Members of both Houses. For that purpose Members of the Senate will proceed to the Hall of the House at about 12:15 p. m.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RUSSELL was excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from today through Thursday of next week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

On request of Mr. PASTORE, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MOODY, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2550.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] for himself and other Senators. On this question, under the unanimous-consent agreement, debate is limited, and the time until 4:30 p. m. today is divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the amendment, and is to be controlled by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in favor of the substitute, and by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] in opposition.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between both sides, since the Senate is operating under a limitation of debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona makes a point of no quorum and asks unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between both sides. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 25 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, we have been discussing the McCarran bill for more than a week. Originally our request was that the McCarran bill be re-committed to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study. At the same time request was made that Senate bill 2842, introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], myself, and 12 other Senators, be also sent to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to hold hearings on it.

The Senate in its wisdom rejected that motion. So we now have before us an amendment in the form of the bill introduced by myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and 12 other Senators.

We have opposed the McCarran bill because we believe it incorporates in the immigration, naturalization, and denaturalization policy of the United States certain factors which are dangerous not only to the security of our country but to the entire field of civil rights and the rights of citizens and aliens in our country.

The first of the many objections to the McCarran bill which we have stressed, and which I shall stress again very briefly today, are that it does not provide for the pooling of unused quotas. Thus thousands of visas which might be used by freedom-seeking individuals are wasted. Such freedom-seeking individuals would make good citizens. They would come from countries like Greece, Italy, Latvia, Luthuania, Estonia, the Middle East, and oriental countries, and would include German expellees.

The McCarran bill furthermore, unfortunately, and I think dangerously, adds many grounds for exclusion, thus making our immigration laws far harsher and more restrictive without furthering our national welfare. For example, it would bar any alien convicted of two or more offenses, other than political offenses, involving prison terms of 5 years or more in his native land. In that way we would bind our laws to the standards

of other nations, many of them totalitarian. Inasmuch as totalitarian regimes frequently "frame" political opponents on trumped-up charges, this provision might also result in the exclusion of victims of political, racial, or religious persecution.

We have already pointed out that under the McCarran bill Cardinal Mindszenty would have to be excluded from admission into this country, because, in addition to the two political offenses with which he was charged in the trumped-up indictment, there were included two other charges of a nonpolitical nature, namely speculating in the currency of the country and hoarding certain currencies or materials.

The McCarran bill adds a host of new and arbitrary grounds for deportation. It permits the deportation of an alien convicted of even minor criminal offenses no matter how long he may have lived in the United States. An alien who had lived here for 20 years could be deported for a traffic violation, if in the judgment of the Attorney General he is undesirable. It is highly dangerous to grant such arbitrary power to any individual.

The McCarran bill allows deportation of an alien who becomes a public charge regardless of his length of residence in the United States. This inhumane provision would severely penalize non-citizens for conditions often beyond their control.

The McCarran bill requires the Attorney General to deport any alien—and I emphasize this point—even though he had led a model life here for many years, should it be discovered that at the time of entry he was actually in an excludable class. Thus, had he entered the country in violation of a minor technicality, deportation would be mandatory even if the violation were due to error. There would be no discretion lodged in any agency or any officer of the Government to change a ruling by the Attorney General.

The McCarran bill makes deportable an alien who may have engaged in any proscribed activity after entry, no matter how long ago, and even if such activity or affiliation had long since been sincerely repudiated. The provision is inconsistent with another section of the McCarran bill which allows the entry of reformed members of totalitarian organizations.

The McCarran bill withdraws the discretion granted to the Attorney General under existing law to suspend deportation in certain meritorious cases. Present statutes permit the Attorney General to suspend deportation when the alien has resided in the United States for 7 years and has proved himself of good character, or when deportation would result in "serious detriment or hardship" to the alien or his family. The McCarran bill requires proof of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship," rather than merely "serious detriment," and would make the residence requirement a concurrent rather than an alternative requirement.

The McCarran bill—and I emphasize this point because I think it is one of the very serious defects of the bill—does

not provide for a Board of Immigration Appeals which would be independent of Department of Justice officials, to review exclusions or expulsions of aliens. It continues the present exemption of immigration proceedings from the terms of the Administrative Procedure Act, thus blocking correction by the courts of erroneous or unfair judgments of immigration officials.

The McCarran bill sanctions interrogation of aliens by the Immigration Service without a warrant, and imposes harsh penalties for minor infractions, such as failure to carry a registration card at all times, thus surrounding the alien with an atmosphere of repression, which is a poor introduction to the American system of justice for all.

The McCarran bill allows deportation of an alien to any country willing to accept him, even if he has had no prior connection with that country, and even when such deportation might subject him to harsh conditions of life or to racial, religious, or political persecution.

The McCarran bill continues provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which have recently caused so much embarrassment to our Government in international relations. Those provisions have been used to arbitrarily exclude such world-famous scientists as Dr. Ernest D. Chain and Prof. Marcus B. Oliphant, and have covered up flagrant errors of judgment, as in the Ellen Knauff case, where the claim of secrecy on security grounds prevented remedial action.

Mr. President, there is no recourse, no appeal, no means of reversing those decisions.

Finally the McCarran bill in determining the number of men and women who are to be permitted to enter this country as legal residents, regardless of the number who may be anxious to take up their residence here in order to qualify for citizenship, bases the computation, unfairly and unjustly, on the 1920 census. That basis of computation excludes all non-whites in the census. It excludes Negroes, Indians, and all other non-white residents of this country. After all, we are living in 1952. We certainly should not be bound by a census which was taken in 1920, and use a computation which permits and directs the unfair exclusion of probably 20 or 25 percent of those who otherwise could migrate to the United States.

Mr. President, we have been defeated in our effort to recommit the bill. I deeply deplore that, because all we requested the Senate to do was to realize that the McCarran bill was a voluminous document, consisting of 302 pages and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of sections and subsections and that it should have hearings and further study.

Aside from those of us who have opposed the McCarran bill and who, I can assure you, Mr. President, have spent scores of hours and, in fact, weeks in studying the bill, I do not believe there are five Members of the Senate who know what is in the McCarran bill or who have the slightest conception of its provisions. I do not believe that even the members of the Judiciary Committee, aside from the distinguished chairman of the com-

mittee and, of course, his very expert staff, have any idea what is in the McCarran bill or what is in the bill which 14 Senators have introduced, namely, Senate bill 2842. I believe I am justified in making that assertion because since we began to debate this bill, some 10 days ago, with the exception of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the sponsor of Senate bill 2550, not one member of the majority of that committee has appeared on the floor of the Senate to justify or even to explain that bill or to make himself available for questioning in regard to it. Of course, it will be recalled that the committee divided nine to four, with nine members in favor of reporting the bill and four members opposed to reporting it. Those four members submitted minority views.

Mr. President, we moved to recommit Senate bill 2550 to the Judiciary Committee, with instructions to study it further and also to study our bill and to hold further hearings to report to this body. As I have said, that motion failed.

So we have offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Actually the amendment is a bill which was introduced by me, in behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and 12 or 13 other Senators. That bill was introduced away back in October 1951. It also has not been given any hearings and has not been studied. Only a handful of Members of the Senate know what is in that bill.

However, Mr. President, I can say that it is a good bill. It would liberalize and humanize our immigration and naturalization laws. That bill is bipartisan. It was not introduced under the auspices of Democrats alone; it was introduced under the auspices and with the militant support of a number of Republican Members of this body, as well.

Mr. President, I do not claim that our bill corrects all the defects of the McCarran bill, many of which I have mentioned in the last few minutes. But our bill does correct a substantial number of the most important defects, dangers, and threats of the McCarran bill. Our bill provides for the pooling of unused quotas and the making available of unused quotas to immigrants from areas which now have historically based small quotas. Our bill gives preference (a) to the reuniting of families; (b) to persons of special skills; and (c) to religious and political persecutees. Any portions of the pooled quotas not used for the above preferences would be made available for all other especially meritorious cases for whom assurances would be provided by American citizens or by reputable American organizations.

Mr. President, as I have already pointed out, our present immigration law was enacted in 1924, as I recall, and was amended in 1929. The act of 1924 was placed on the statute books during a period of suspicion, hatred, and distrust of all foreigners, as a result of our unhappy experience in the first World War. That act is based on a niggardly quota system which permits the admission into the United States of only 154,000 persons a year. However, that is not the worst feature of that act, Mr. President. Incidentally, I wish to point

out that our bill would not change the quotas.

The 1924 act was based upon a percentage of the persons living in the United States in 1890, enumerated by nationality stock. It disregarded the substantial influx into the United States of other peoples of the world who entered our country between 1890 and 1920—natives of Greece, Poland, Italy, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and other countries. They were disregarded. That act was a deliberate and successful attempt to confine, in large part, immigration into the United States to natives of the countries of northern Europe. Of course, I realize that the immigrants from those countries have done much for our country. But they are not the only ones who can be placed in that category. Italians and Greeks, for instance, have also done much to build up our Nation. So have Lithuanians, Rumanians, and Hungarians, as well as many persons from the oriental countries.

As a result of that policy, which was adhered to, nearly 80 percent of the 154,000 persons admitted under the quota system to the United States each year came from the countries of Northern Europe—from Great Britain, northern Ireland, southern Ireland, Holland, Belgium, and France—and only approximately 20 percent came from the other countries of Europe. Great Britain alone was given a quota of 66,000; Ireland was given a quota of 26,000; Germany was given a large quota.

Mr. President, our bill would not change those quotas. We want persons to come to the United States from Great Britain and Ireland as they have come in the past because we know that such persons will make a valuable contribution to the life and economy of our country. Under our bill, we would not reduce in the slightest degree the quotas for those countries. What we are saying in our bill is that if people living in England do not want to come to this country—and, although they have a quota of 66,000 a year, only 20,000 a year come here under the quota, leaving 46,000 unused numbers—the unused numbers of their quota should be made available to the people of Italy, Greece, and the other countries I have enumerated. Likewise, in the same way and to the same degree, the unused quota of Ireland should be allotted to other nations. The Irish people have made a magnificent contribution to the life of this country. They have not used more than 30 or 40 percent of their quotas for many years. We want people from England and Ireland to come here; but if they cannot come, or if they do not see fit to accept our invitation, let us not waste those numbers, but let us permit people from other countries, who would make an equally great contribution, to come to this country for the purpose of seeking citizenship.

I believe there has not been 1 year within the past 15 years when even the niggardly quota of 154,000 has been used to the extent of more than 40 or 50 percent. The figures may be found in the RECORD, having been placed there by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUM-

PHREY], and myself. Those figures are pathetic.

Today, under the quota system, we limit the number of people who may come to the United States from Greece to 308, and we limit the number who may come from Italy to 5,800. Twenty years or more ago their quota was nearly 50,000. Why should these people be excluded? Why should the people of other countries who have contributed so much to our Nation be excluded when there is room for them?

We are not asking that they shall receive any special or preferential treatment. They must pass the scrutiny of our Immigration Service, of our State Department, and of other agencies, the same as anyone else. But, Mr. President, let us not enact a law under which not more than 308 people can come to this country from Greece, 100 from Lithuania, 5,800 from Italy, and about 1,700 from Austria. Even those ungenerous numbers have been cut down, because under the Displaced Persons Act an alien who had fled to another country was charged to the quota of his native land. As a result—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota kindly yield me an additional 10 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield the Senator another 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. LEHMAN. The result is that one-half the quotas of those countries are mortgaged, not for 1 or 2 or 5 years, but in some case for as long as 300 years. The quota of Greece is half-mortgaged today up to the year 2013, I believe. The quotas of Lithuania and Latvia are mortgaged until the year 2220, or approximately that date.

Mr. President, I could speak endlessly on this subject. It simply does not make sense to me that when we have available places for these people we slam our doors upon them and say to the Italians, for instance, "You are not good enough to come into our country. Those who are already in this country are good enough to bear their share in the economy and life of our Nation, but we do not want more than 5,800." We say that to German expellees. We are saying that to refugees from behind the iron curtain, from Poland, Hungary, and Rumania. Mr. President, I submit it does not make sense; it is inhuman, and, in my opinion, it is stupid so far as the interests of our Nation are concerned.

Under the McCarran bill the Attorney General would be given the right to exclude anyone for almost any cause, if, in his opinion, the alien might commit some act 20 years hence which would be prejudicial. No legal appeal of any real consequence is provided. The decision is made by a man appointed by the Attorney General under regulations promulgated by the Attorney General, and the final decision rests entirely within the discretion of the Attorney General. The amendment we have offered estab-

lishes a statutory Board of Immigration Appeals, its members to be appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. That is what should be provided. The people to whom I am referring, and all other people who may be excluded by the consuls for purely arbitrary reasons when they present requests for visas should have the right to proceed in a legal, formal, and fair way before an unbiased, statutory board. The matter should not be left entirely to the discretion of the Attorney General or entirely to the discretion of officials of our consular service.

Under our amendment we would wipe out from the immigration laws all discriminations based upon race. Much has been said here about how the McCarran bill would wipe out discrimination against orientals. I say the McCarran bill not only would not wipe it out but that it would increase it. It would fix it as a matter of law. It has always been recognized that natives of certain countries may apply for admission to the United States. In the case of every country in the Western Hemisphere we go much further. Those countries are not even covered by the quota system. One hundred and fifty million of them could apply for admission to this country. They have not applied in large numbers, and I do not know that they will. But, even if they should, they would have to pass the careful scrutiny of our Immigration Service. But, Mr. President, 150,000,000 citizens of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere may come into this country outside the quota system, except in the case of orientals. In the case of orientals born in Brazil, the Argentine, Canada, and other countries in the Western Hemisphere, they cannot come into this country under any circumstances, but they are excluded. They do not have the rights of other citizens. An oriental may have resided in Brazil for 40 years, he may have amassed great wealth, and he may be a leading citizen; yet he is excluded. What is more, Mr. President, under the McCarran bill an oriental born in London, of one-half oriental stock—whatever that means; I do not know; that is what the law says—is not charged to the British quota but is charged to the quota of 100 allotted to the oriental country. Furthermore, we say China may send us 100, India may send us 100, Japan may send us 100, and the Philippines may send us 100, but we limit the total number of orientals from all over the world to 2,000 because the McCarran bill would set up an Asiatic or oriental triangle. The McCarran bill allows 100 from each country, but, in the aggregate, the number is limited to 2,000.

In the case of the Philippines, we have taken away a right which has been theirs for a long time. They, too, have been limited, of course, in the number that can enter the United States. They have been limited within the past 2 years, although we gave them the right of naturalization during the war when we still remembered their great contribution to the security of our country and to the peace and security of the world. But even when we limited them to 100 there

was no limitation on the admission of a Filipino if he were a Filipino by birth. If he came from England or Brazil or the Argentine, he came in under the quota of those countries. But that right has been removed, and a Filipino who is adjudged by an American consul, within his sole discretion, to have 50 percent of oriental blood—and I repeat that I do not know what that means, because I do not think it can ever be determined—is not charged to the British quota, but to the Philippine quota, thus reducing by a substantial extent the number of persons who can come in under this ungenerous and inhumane law. I am told the Filipino Government has protested to our State Department against this provision as being a definite and clear discrimination against their people.

Mr. President, in our proposal we have given preferences to fathers, mothers, grandfathers, and grandmothers, who want to come to this country and be reunited with their families. Their families want that kind of reunion.

Under the McCarran bill, anyone, no matter how old he may be, is not only subjected to the test of being able to read and write in his own language, but before he can apply for citizenship in this country, he must demonstrate that he can write in English. There is not one person in 10,000 who comes to the United States from another country at the age of 60 years who can acquire familiarity with the English language sufficiently to write it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield two more minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I beg the Members of the Senate to give heed to what I have said and to what my associates have said. If we pass the McCarran bill, we shall be doing a grave disservice to the people of this country, to our relations with other countries, and to the peace of the world. The McCarran bill contains provisions which are dangerous. Our bill does not cure all the defects, as I have said. We would have to debate the subject for 4 months, I believe, in order to cover all the defects in the McCarran bill. I know we cannot cure them all, and we are not going to undertake to do so. We hate filibusters, and we shall not propose that kind of procedure. But our bill does cure at least some of the major defects of the McCarran bill. It is a liberal bill. It is a humane bill. It is a bill which is in the interest of millions of persons in this country, including aliens, naturalized citizens, and native-born citizens, because there are things in the McCarran bill which would threaten their security.

I cannot believe that the Senate is going to pass that kind of a bill without at least giving the proponents of the other bills which have been introduced an opportunity to be heard, including great religious, civic, and nationality organizations who protest many of the

important features of the McCarran bill and who support the bill which we have introduced.

I am sorry, Mr. President, that as is usual the junior Senator from Minnesota and I are talking to empty chairs, but we want the American people to know the situation, and we shall continue to talk and to tell the people about the bad features of the McCarran bill so far as we can, although, as I say, it may take us many months to do it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday, May 19, the Senate, by a vote of 44 to 28, rejected a motion to recommend the so-called McCarran bill to the Judiciary Committee for the purpose of further hearings upon that bill and upon the so-called Humphrey-Lehman bill, Senate bill 2842.

I mention this, Mr. President, because I think it is important to take note of the fact that 28 Members of this body felt very strongly that the measure before the Senate should not be acted upon at this time, but that it should go back to the committee, in light of the testimony and evidence presented in the debate, for further consideration and further study.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a galley proof of the statement of the position of certain organizations pertaining to the McCarran bill, Senate bill 2550. I make note of the fact that on the desk of each Senator this morning is a statement of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] endorsing his measure. It is indicated that the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which inadvertently was listed as being in opposition to the McCarran bill in the address of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], has not put itself on record in opposition to the bill. In fact, it supports the McCarran bill.

I want to make note of the fact that the position of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and that of all Catholic organizations was summarized at a meeting from which a statement was released on March 12, 1952, recommending certain changes in Senate bill 2550, section by section. Those changes were not incorporated in the bill, since the bill had been reported before March.

I think it is important to note that there are 16 sections of the pending bill which have the strong opposition of the Catholic organizations which held a general session for the discussion of the measure known as the McCarran bill.

I read from the press release of March 12, 1952:

By invitation of the executive department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, a meeting was held in Washington on March 3 for the purpose of discussing the broad aspects of the immigration situation, services to refugees, and the outlook regarding future immigration into the United States. Present were representatives of the legal department and Bureau of Immigration, NCWC, the National Council of Catholic Men and National Council of Catholic Women, War Relief Services, NCWC,

Catholic Committee for Refugees, and the National Conference of Catholic Charities.

Of special importance in the discussions was the question of arriving at a unified policy for continued collaboration with the Protestant, Jewish, and other groups who have labored so zealously and with great success in servicing the refugees from Europe and are lending their efforts toward creating a more democratic and Christian attitude toward immigrant people.

From there on this entire statement, which I shall not put into the RECORD, but of which I make note, contains a series of recommendations for amendment of the McCarran bill. Some of the amendments we have offered embody those recommendations. That is why we have presented as many amendments as we have. Many organizations saw the inadequacy of the McCarran bill and came forward with a series of proposals, other than the recommendations the Senator from Nevada has placed before us, that are worthy of some comment.

For example, the Senator from Nevada makes note of the fact that the Japanese-American Citizens League supports his measure. I would have the Senate know that the reason for the support of the Japanese-American Citizens League is as stated in the letter of May 8 to the Senator from Nevada:

As you are well aware, our organization has been in the forefront of those who have urged the extension of naturalization rights to all loyal resident aliens, without regard to race or national origin. In addition, we have strongly advocated the complete repeal of the oriental exclusion acts, which will abolish a needless barrier to understanding between our Government and the peoples of the Far East.

The elimination of these racial prohibitions, as provided by your bill, is not only a matter of long-deferred justice but will have an enormously salutary effect upon our international relations.

I wish to make note of that because the substitute measure, which is now before the Senate, to which I shall soon direct my remarks, provides complete abolition of the racial-discrimination features as they pertain to orientals. I would say to my friends from the Japanese-American Citizens League—and I have many friends in that organization—that their support of the McCarran bill is primarily support, as they have testified, for the areas of the bill which remove all types of discrimination, and which provide for the removal of the oriental-exclusion provisions of the present immigration law.

Mr. President, I shall go through the substitute measure, item by item, and tell the Senate what it seeks to accomplish. Why do we present the substitute? We present it because we believe a bill which is 302 pages long, which, in the minds of 28 United States Senators, should have been recommitted to committee, should not be passed by the Senate until every single aspect of it is clearly discussed and carefully gone over in its relationship to our total immigration policy.

I suppose it is like repeating the same old words to say that the McCarran bill, S. 2550, is more than a recodification. It is an amendment of, it is a change in, it is a fundamental digression from the established immigration policy of the

United States. It is misleading and wrong to state that what it does is merely to liberalize and to recodify. In fact, it restricts as it recodifies; and it not only recodifies, but it builds in a whole new area of immigration law. I do not believe even the proponents of the McCarran bill deny that it contains many new features, features which have been brought out in debate here as being undesirable. Many of those features will be attacked point by point, by amendment, in case our substitute measure should fail, but I think it would be well for the Senate to understand the substitute measure that is before it.

The substitute is a bill 11 pages long, as compared to the McCarran bill with its 302 pages of legislative proposals which embody numerous cross references. With all the due regard and respect I have for my colleagues—and there are many able lawyers in this body—I submit there is not one Member of the Senate who can go through that bill of 302 pages, and on the floor of the Senate, in debate, point out what each and every one of its provisions means, because it is indeed a legislative maze trap. It involves one series after another of changes in immigration policy, cross references to old immigration laws, and a building in of a new series of immigration law. Thus it constitutes a tremendously perplexing legislative problem.

What do we offer? We have something to offer to the Senate. We have an alternative. That is the purpose of the substitute measure. We are not offering our bill, S. 2842, as a substitute. We are not doing so because it, too, is a complicated bill. It, too, involves many, many areas of immigration policy which need to be reevaluated and restated. But we have eliminated what are considered to be the obvious glaring inequities of the present immigration laws, and by the substitute measure to the McCarran bill we are trying to give some relief, some semblance of justice, to the immigration policy at this session of Congress.

What does our substitute provide? First, I may say to the Japanese-American Citizens League, it completely and totally removes racial barriers as a means of disqualification for naturalization and for admission into the United States. In other words, the Exclusion Act is repealed and racial discrimination, insofar as orientals are concerned, is removed. That is No. 1.

Under section 1 of the substitute measure, now on the desk of every Senator:

No person shall be denied the right to become a citizen of the United States or the privilege to enter the United States as an immigrant solely on the ground of his race, nor shall any applicant for admission be assigned to a quota solely on the basis of his race.

Mr. President, this is unqualifiedly a removal of racial barriers and racial discrimination in immigration policy. I submit this meets the requirements of the Chinese, the Japanese, the Filipino, and others who are so concerned about racial barriers in our immigration laws.

In substance the same features are in the McCarran bill—at least, some of them are—the amendment in the nature of a substitute completely eliminates racial barriers and discrimination and thus meets the need that many a Senator feels so deeply in his heart should be met.

What is the second feature of the amendment? It has been discussed eloquently in some detail by a number of Senators, most recently by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. The second feature relates to pooled quotas. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on Monday of this week read into the RECORD, and discussed for the purpose of enlightening the Senate, our whole immigration policy from 1890 to 1929, the time of the last major revision of the immigration laws.

The pooled quota provision we recommend is, in substance, this: Out of approximately 150,000 eligible immigrants to the United States each year, we have been admitting from 70,000 to 80,000.

The reason for this is that the major number of immigrants who come under the quota system, which is based on national origins, is allotted to Great Britain and northern Ireland, and those two countries have not been completely using their quotas. Despite all the many unkind words sometimes hurled against the British on the floor of the Senate, there are still people in Britain who seem to like their country, so they stay there and do not come to the United States.

The Senator from Illinois pointed out how the British quota became so large. He showed how certain discriminatory features were written into the immigration law of 1920, so as to place emphasis upon the British quota and de-emphasis upon quotas of other countries. I shall not burden the RECORD by going over all that statistical information; it is there for all persons to study. Our pool quota program—and it is the second section of our substitute bill—simply says that quota figures which are not used shall be placed in a pool, and from the pool, visas shall be issued for purposes of immigration on a preferential basis.

What preferential basis do we outline? For example, we say that 25 percent of all unused visas, or 25 percent of the quota pool, shall be for family reunion preference, or for purposes of family reunion. The language simply points out that the quota shall be available to adult children, brothers and sisters, and other blood relatives, and to spouses, children, parents, brothers and sisters, and other blood relatives of naturalized citizens of the United States. That is what we call family reunion preference under the pool quota. It comprises 25 percent of the total pool.

Another 25 percent of the pool quota would go to persons who, because of their fine education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability, are urgently needed in the United States.

First, we would take people for humanitarian or compassionate reasons. We would give special preference to 25 percent of the pool for family reunion.

Secondly, for purposes of our national security and welfare, we would allot 25 percent of the available pool of unused quotas to persons of special skills which are urgently needed.

Thirdly, we would take 25 percent of the pool for religious or political persecutees, people who have had the courage to stand up for and adhere to their religion and politics, or their democratic faith, but yet have been expelled or driven out of their native countries. We feel the United States ought to be a refuge for those good souls, insofar as unused quotas are concerned.

Then there is another 25 percent, which completes the use of this pool, for nonpreference cases. The substitute provides:

All pooled visas not required for issuance under the foregoing preferences shall be available, on application to the Secretary of State by an American citizen or a reputable American organization, to other immigrants, whose cases because of special circumstances or hardship merit special consideration, in the order of their registration.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does this section in the substitute affect the usage of the 1920 census?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It does not.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, this provision would not increase the number who may now come into the country if all the quota numbers were fully utilized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. PASTORE. All this provision does is to establish a program to facilitate the usage of the full number, through the use of the pooling system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make clear what the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposes to do. It deals with two important features which have been discussed before the Immigration Subcommittee and which are of public importance. One is the elimination of the oriental racial barriers, so that Japanese, Chinese, people of the Republic of India, and the peoples of southeast Asia would no longer be confronted by any racial barrier excluding them from the United States under its immigration policy. This means a great deal to people of Japanese ancestry, and particularly to the Chinese. The substitute would remove the racial barrier.

Secondly, the substitute takes into consideration the unused quotas, which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] discussed last week. The unused quotas would then be distributed on the basis of certain preferences.

First, there is the family reunion preference. Second, there is the preference

based on our own national need for immigrants possessing special abilities or skills. Third, there is the preference given to religious and political persecutees. Finally, there is the preference for immigrants who may be brought into this country by reputable American citizens or reputable American organizations. For example, the National Lutheran Council, the National Catholic Welfare Council, or the B'nai B'rith of the Jewish faith, may wish to sponsor an immigrant. Those are fundamental changes in the immigration policy, and I think they are meritorious. We are not entering into a complete rewriting of immigration law. These provisions represent obvious needs.

Another feature is the establishment of a Board of Immigration Appeals. I submit that it is imperative that such a Board be established. We have placed far too much authority in the hands of consuls in various places through the world, who are frequently untrained. We place far too much authority in the hands of the Attorney General. I think we must recognize, as has been recognized on this floor in the debate, that we must not in any way abuse, adulterate, or weaken the processes under the Administrative Procedure Act, a public law enacted by the Congress of the United States.

The Immigration Appeals Board would enable a person who felt that he had been unjustly dealt with, who felt that the facts had not been fully weighed, to have an impartial tribunal before which he could appear. There would be none of the business of judge, jury, and prosecutor all in one man, a situation which, as we have pointed out, would exist under the terms of the McCarran bill.

Finally, we point out that there are certain nonquota immigrants. Who are the nonquota immigrants? They are covered in section 4 of our substitute. In that category we place parents of naturalized American citizens. I do not see how the Senate can turn down this proposal. I do not see how the Congress can rewrite legislation in the field of immigration without recognizing the legitimacy of this argument.

Let us assume that in the city of Providence, R. I., there is a man, his wife, and his family. They are naturalized Americans. Let us assume that they are of Italian ancestry. They have a good business, or the breadwinner is working in a shop or factory. He has a small home, a bank account, and some insurance policies. His children are attending school. The members of his family are good members of the church. They are good members of the community, participating citizens.

Back in the old country is the mother of the breadwinner. She is now 74 years old. She has not seen her son for 40 or 45 years. All she has ever had has been a letter. In the twilight of her life she would like to come to the United States and spend the last 2 or 3 years of her life with her son, her daughter-in-law, and her grandchildren. The McCarran bill would deny her such an opportunity unless she was able to come here under the quota. The quota for her native country

is oversubscribed. It is impossible for her to get into the United States for permanent residence. The most she would be able to get would be a visitor's visa; and after she had been here about 60 days she would have to go home. Under such circumstances people go home sick at heart. I have seen such cases. I happen to know of case after case like the one I have described.

I submit that the United States is big enough, strong enough, and rich enough to provide room for the dear old folk who want to come here and spend the twilight of their lives with their sons or daughters and with their grandchildren, and enjoy the blessings of the United States of America. That is what the substitute provides for.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that the people who would qualify under that particular provision are very limited in number? Are not their numbers fast waning?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The number is very limited.

Mr. PASTORE. The old folk are dying off. Moreover, we would not run the risk that they might displace anyone in this country who has a job, for the simple reason that they are too old to work.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. These are people who would come here and sit in their son's or daughter's parlor for the remainder of their lives. As the Senator has aptly put it, they are in the twilight of their lives. This provision is the most humanitarian we could enact to build up good will among other countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think I shall require about 5 minutes more and then I shall take my seat. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The category of nonquota immigrants also provides for orphans of naturalized American citizens and orphans of certain aliens. There is a large group of persons who may be classified under the designation of orphans.

Provision is also made for members of the Armed Forces of the United States. There are other preference categories which I could mention, but I do not wish to take the time to do so.

The final provision in our substitute is for the removal of sex discriminations. The present immigration law has certain discriminatory features in relationship to sex. There is no argument on this point. The McCarran bill has in it a provision similar to the one in our substitute bill.

Another category of preference is reformed members of proscribed organizations. At the present time some persons are denied admittance to this country because at one time they were members

of an organization which later became listed as subversive. Perhaps they have left the organization or perhaps they joined the organization without even knowing what its purposes are. Once that fact can be ascertained, both the McCarran bill and our substitute would provide that they may come to the United States.

There are some features in our substitute which are also in the McCarran bill. There are other features in our substitute which are not found in the McCarran bill. My argument is this: We have been able to demonstrate without successful contradiction that there are a number of provisions in the McCarran bill—yes; hundreds of provisions—which are inequitable, which literally threaten the principle of due process of law, which violate the Administrative Procedure Act, which place upon the immigration statute books new barriers in terms of discriminatory features; and I submit that the Senate should not proceed to legislate in this complex and intricate field until we have had an opportunity to give all possible consideration to every single argument which has been considered and brought out in this debate. We have had to do in this debate what I had hoped we could do before the Committee on the Judiciary. We have had to make, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, arguments which should have been taken down as testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary.

I appeal to Senators who feel that some improvement is needed in our immigration policy to study our substitute. I say to them that it is fair. It is equitable. It places America in proper relationship with the rest of the world, particularly the Asiatic area of the world. It provides an opportunity for unusual talent to come to this country under the quota-pooling system. It provides opportunity for parents of naturalized citizens to come to this country, and for orphans, wives, and children of members of the Armed Forces. I believe ours is a measure which will meet the needs. My appeal to the Senate is not to try to enact 302 pages of legislative proposals before we have had an opportunity to understand thoroughly and to consider them, but to enact a bill that is reasonable, fair, and understandable.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that the so-called Lehman-Humphrey bill, as originally introduced, provided for a pooling of quotas?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That was the first time that the idea was advanced, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. The pooling in that instance was predicated upon the census which was taken in 1950.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. As against the McCarran bill, which provides for the use of a formula which is predicated upon the census taken in 1920.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. The use of the 1950 census as against the use of the 1920

census means that perhaps between 75,000 and 100,000 more people could come in, because there has been an increase in the population of this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not correct to say that the substitute bill which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has been discussing is not predicated upon the 1950 census, which would call for an increase in the number of eligible people to come to the country, but is predicated upon the formula which is used in the McCarran bill, so-called, which would still limit the over-all number of immigrants to from 150,000 to 154,000 a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct. We did not include in our substitute measure the 1950 census. Personally I think the substitute is thereby weakened, but I have sensed in the Senate a desire not to change the census base. However, there remains a paradox. While the Senate does not want to change the census base it is apparently perfectly willing to change the whole body of our immigration law insofar as deportation, exclusion, and naturalization are concerned. I believe that the burden of proof rests upon the proponents of the McCarran bill to present reasonable evidence as to why we should not change the census base if we are to change everything else.

Mr. President, we have tried to offer to the Senate a reasonable bill. I would say it is a very conservative and moderate measure which corrects certain errors which are obvious on their face, and deals with areas of our immigration policy in a way which every group I know of has agreed to be desirable and profitable and worthy of attention in the interests of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself one more minute in order to answer another question by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota admit that the principal purpose of using the same formula was to satisfy Senators who possibly like the idea of the pooling system, but do not like the idea of an increase in the over-all number of immigrants by possibly 100,000?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct. We keep down the number of immigrants but we pool the quotas which are available. We remove racial discriminations and provide for family immigration. I ask those in opposition, who may wish to vote against the substitute bill, to bring forth a legitimate argument against it. It is a reasonable, conservative, and middle-ground proposal. It would give us a basically reasonable immigration policy. It makes good sense, and it meets the needs of every group in the country which has cried out for relief.

I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, later this week I shall discuss at much greater length than time permits this afternoon

some of the legal objections which I raise to the McCarran bill.

In the brief time I shall speak this afternoon, I wish at the outset to pay what is a very sincere and, in my opinion, a highly deserved compliment to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Those two sound liberals and great humanitarians are making a historic record in connection with this bill. It is a record which in due course of time, as Father Time judges the record, will prove them to be eternally right.

Mr. President, here again is before the Senate a piece of legislation which ought to be approached primarily from the standpoint of human values. Its importance ought to be recognized from the standpoint of the fact that, after all, the very strength of our democracy depends upon the extent to which we protect human values. The great tenet that it is the dignity of the individual and the sacredness of human life which count in any system of self-government once again becomes crystal clear in connection with this debate.

It is a matter of deep regret to me to find such obvious apathy in the Senate with regard to the great issues which are involved in this piece of legislation. It is no surprise to me to find the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York once again, as they have so many times since they have been Members of this body, making a courageous and far-seeing fight for great humanitarian principles and for the protection of human values. In fact, I would say that in my judgment this is the third great historic debate in which they have participated since they have been Members of this body, which will go down as noteworthy in the history of the Senate, as students of the Senate come to study the record of this parliamentary body in the decades ahead.

I refer first to the great tax debate of the last session of this Congress, when again these two liberal Senators made a record in the tax fight in support of the interests of the common men and women of America. That I think represents a great tribute to their statesmanship. Earlier this year these two sound liberal Senators again made a notable record in connection with the fight on the internal revenue bill, where again the same issues of human rights dominated. They took on all comers in those two debates. The RECORD will speak for itself. In the judgment of the junior Senator from Oregon the major arguments in those two historic debates as advanced by the Senator from Minnesota, and the Senator from New York, remained unanswered at the close of the debate.

Oh yes, Mr. President, we did not have the votes in the Senate to sustain those arguments, but I am willing to let students of history judge whether the merits were not on the side of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York.

The other day the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], made what I predict will go down in polemic literature as one of the most

beautiful speeches on sound humanitarianism that has ever been delivered in this body. It is my regret that I was not present to hear the Senator from Rhode Island deliver his speech.

Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset of my remarks today that when students read the speeches of HUMPHREY, LEHMAN, and PASTORE on the immigration bill the question that will be raised in their minds in the years ahead will be: "Why was it that the Senate of the United States unanimously did not recognize the soundness of the premises advanced by those Senators?"

I ascribe it principally to apathy. I say it most respectfully when I say I ascribe it to the fact—and I believe it to be a fact—that a large number of my colleagues in the Senate, as I indicated the other day, have yet to read, let alone study, the 302 pages of the complicated and complex omnibus immigration bill known as the McCarran bill.

I think it is now pretty well known that the full Senate Judiciary Committee never gave thorough study to this bill. The bill is before us really as the bill of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is a bill which ought to be laid aside until the Senate can, as it should, take the time to study its implications. It would be very unwise for the Senate to pass a bill such as this which, in my opinion, in the course of time will prove to be very bad legislation, legislation which the Senate will regret, and which in large measure it will have to revise drastically and in part repeal, if we are to live up to and protect the kind of humanitarian principles and human values to which the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Rhode Island have been directing the Senate's attention for some days.

Of course, Mr. President, I realize that in this period of high emotional tensions in our Nation, a spirit of blind, biased, nationalism seems to be overcoming millions of our fellow citizens. We see such blind nationalism manifest itself in connection with a great many issues, and most prominently in connection with issues affecting foreign policy. Of course, questions of immigration are directly connected with the entire foreign policy attitude of the American people.

I wish to say that if we are going to think in terms of the century ahead—which happens to be the obligation of statesmanship on the part of Members of Congress at this session—then we had better recognize that we should not try to live unto ourselves alone in connection with immigration problems for, if we do, we shall walk out on the principles and policies of our forefathers which have made the United States the great Nation it is today, and we shall antagonize millions of persons the world around, whose support, cooperation, and alliance we shall sorely need in the century ahead, as we go forward in that troubled period, in the contest between the free way of life and the enslaved way of life, the latter being represented by Russian communism. In my judgment if we follow such a restricted, nationalistic attitude in regard to immigration,

we shall not strengthen the bonds of the freedom way of life around the world, but in my opinion we shall play into the hands of the propoganda of Russian communism.

Mr. President, to take a stand such as I take has already started criticisms coming from various reactionary forces and isolationist forces. These days I am receiving mail and telegrams severely criticizing me because I will not accept a narrow conception for the immigration policies of our Nation. Not long ago I received such a bitter letter from a critic. I replied to that letter as follows:

I have your letter of February 6, in which you urge that the immigration laws be tightened. You say that it "would be tantamount to treason for any Senator or Representative to vote to liberalize the immigration laws at this time."

Of course, Mr. President, the type of name-calling tactic that this person used in her letter to me is typical of the emotions of the time. She would make me out a traitor to my country if I insisted on keeping faith with what I believe has been one of the great strengths of my country, namely, the recognition of humanitarian values in connection with its immigration program.

So, Mr. President, having been called, in effect, a traitor, in her letter, I continued in my reply as follows:

In reply, I ask you to reflect on the following three points:

1. On February 12, 1861—exactly 91 years ago—Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we observe today, said in a speech to the German people in Cincinnati:

"It is not my nature when I see a people borne down by the weight of their shackles—the oppression of tyranny—to make their life more bitter by heaping upon them greater burdens; but rather would I do all in my power to raise the yoke than to add anything that would tend to crush them."

Mr. President, when we come to vote on the McCarran bill, I believe we had better reflect once again on that great humanitarian doctrine of the immortal Lincoln.

Returning to my letter, Mr. President, the second point I raised with my correspondent was:

2. The following words inscribed on the Statue of Liberty have been an inspiration to millions who have come to the United States:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,

I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

Mr. President, as we come to vote on the McCarran bill, I think we can well afford to read again that inspiring inscription on the Statue of Liberty. If we give meaning to that inscription, by means of the action we take in the Senate of the United States on this omnibus immigration bill, we shall lay aside the bill and we shall adopt, for the time being, a substitute proposal similar to the one the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have offered to the Senate. Then we shall study the McCarran bill for such length of time as

is required to eliminate from it some of its serious shortcomings and some of its sections which in my opinion cannot be reconciled with the great inspirational tenet of Americanism which we find inscribed on the Statue of Liberty.

Again returning to my letter, previously referred to, I said to this critic in the third place:

3. Unless you are a descendant of the native Americans who lived in this country before the coming of the white man, I assume that your ancestors came here as immigrants, no doubt with high hope of living a fruitful and useful life. What would have been their reaction if they had been turned back and told, "You cannot enter; America is for Americans"?

Mr. President, at this time let me make a few references to the substitute proposal; and then I wish to discuss some of the constitutional questions which I believe to be raised by the McCarran bill.

First of all, in the substitute bill we have sought to bring together the particular topics which we believe are of immediate concern to the Senate; and we postpone for final action other topics contained in the long McCarran bill of 302 pages.

We have submitted a simple bill of 11 pages, and in that bill we have included the following topics:

Removal of racial disqualification for naturalization and for admission into the United States.

The latter have just been discussed so eloquently and cogently by the Senator from Minnesota that I need not make further comment.

Board of Immigration Appeals.

Such a board is most important, it seems to me, if we are really going to follow a basic principle of American jurisprudence, namely, that all persons, including aliens, coming within the jurisdiction of our Government, are entitled to a fair hearing and a fair trial.

Nonquota immigrants: Parents, orphans, members of the Armed Forces.

That is a subject which the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota have already discussed today.

Preference categories.

Removal of sex discrimination.

Mr. President, when we take those topics out of the McCarran bill and modify them in the form in which we have modified them in our substitute bill, we then have in one bill the features which are of immediate concern to the Senate and on which I believe we should pass judgment and enact legislation before we adjourn in July.

The other portions included in the 302 pages of the McCarran bill can wait until the Senate, with greater deliberation and with more time to study the implications of its provisions, can pass judgment upon them. I believe the Senate will be able to do that much more fairly and much more intelligently at a later date than it would be able to do if the McCarran bill were forced through the Senate following this debate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to finish the argument, after which I shall be glad to yield.

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIONS TO S. 2250

Mr. President, I now desire to call attention to what I consider to be some of the constitutional objections to the McCarran bill. One of the best reasons for voting for the substitute bill is to be found in the fact that the McCarran bill, in my judgment, contains within it a great many legal weaknesses. We ought to go thoroughly into the legal objections to the McCarran bill, clarify them, and, after months of study, return at the next session of the Congress to proceed at that time to pass an immigration bill covering more points than those covered in the substitute bill.

Mr. President, I emphasize that one of the fundamental constitutional principles decided by an early Supreme Court case is that under the due process clause of the fifth amendment a fair hearing must be accorded to an alien before he can be deported. This principle was recently reaffirmed by the highest court of our land, in the now famous case of *Sung against McGrath*, which I shall discuss in great detail later this week. Nevertheless, in complete disregard of this principle, in my judgment, S. 2550 provides that alien crewmen may be summarily deported without hearings, and that certain aliens entering illegally may be deported without granting them any hearing whatsoever. A committee of the American Bar Association has objected to these provisions denying hearings to deportable aliens. The wording of the bill would seem to grant unconstitutional power to the Attorney General by authorizing him to revoke permanent residence within 5 years of its grant to an alien who may have become a citizen in the meantime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield me five more minutes?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield the Senator 10 more minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Illegal searches and seizures are authorized. The fourth amendment to the Constitution protects citizens and aliens alike from unreasonable searches and seizures. This amendment prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures and hence requires a showing of probable cause.

Sections 235 and 287 (a) of S. 2550 authorizes any immigration officer or employee to board and search without a warrant any conveyance or vehicle within a reasonable distance from any external boundary of the United States and any such conveyance or vehicle anywhere when it is believed that aliens are being brought into the United States. This means that without probable cause that an alien is being illegally transported into the country, any immigration officer may board and inspect the automobile of a citizen of the United States. This provision is unconstitutional. I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that there is serious question as to the constitutionality of this provision.

Further, section 241 (a) (7) authorizes the deportation of an alien who engages or has a purpose to engage in conduct defined as prejudicial to our interests or who has a purpose to organize, join, or participate in subversive organizations designated by the Attorney General. Lack of knowledge of the subversive character of the organization is a defense only where the alien's participation occurred prior to publication of the name of the organization by the Attorney General in the Federal Register. Hence, an alien may be deportable if he had reason to believe that the organization was subversive prior to its designation by the Attorney General. The Attorney General is the sole judge of the reasonableness of the alien's belief. And by the terms of the bill, if the Attorney General determines in 1952 that any legally resident alien who entered the United States in 1910 was at that time likely to at some time join, for instance, the Washington Book Shop, a subversive organization distributing popular books at a discount, he can deport him without any finding that the alien himself was or is subversive. Because of vagueness of the conception of what may be prejudicial to our interests—see *Jordan v. DeGeorge* (341 U. S. 223)—as well as because of the fact that the section would require deportation because of a person's state of mind, it cannot be sustained as being in harmony with our Constitution.

Section 242 (b) would for the first time in our history allow an order of deportation to be made in absentia. Convictions in absentia are not valid and we seriously question the validity of a deportation order entered in absentia, even if an alien has been afforded a reasonable opportunity to be present. It will be noted that in matters of this character, the tendency of the Supreme Court has been to apply criminal standards. See the *DeGeorge* case, previously cited. Certainly a conviction could not be sustained on the ground that the criminal has been given a reasonable opportunity to be present and refused to take advantage of it. At any rate, such procedure for the deportation of aliens should be abhorrent to us and there is no necessity for the same, in order to protect our national rights and interests. We can do this job, Mr. President, without adopting provisions such as those which are to be found in the McCarran bill, which in my opinion give too wide discretion and arbitrary power to administrative officials.

Section 342 authorizes the Attorney General to cancel citizenship certificates and other documents by written notice sent to a person's last known place of address. Similarly, in section 340 (b), provision is made which authorizes denaturalization where a person is absent from the judicial district in which he last had his residence, by publication, and personal service is not made mandatory in either section. The lack of provision for sufficient notice in sections 342 and 340 (b) has led the American Bar Association to object to these provisions in S. 2550. And when I say American Bar Association, I mean a committee of that association. In the

light of *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co.* (339 U. S. 306), the due-process clause would be violated by a statute which authorizes the institution of this type of proceedings by notice sent to a last-known residence or by publication when the whereabouts of the individual are either known or can be obtained so that personal service can be effectuated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield 8 minutes more to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 8 more minutes.

Mr. MORSE. In the field of expatriation, attention is called to section 350 which for the first time would forbid a native born citizen of foreign ancestry who thereby acquired dual nationality, from residing abroad during certain specified periods in his life. Other native born citizens are not so restricted. This type of discrimination between native born citizens, which is obviously based upon ancestry, offends the Constitution. It will be noted that in *Hirabayashi v. United States* (320 U. S. 81, 100) it was stated that "distinctions between citizens solely because of their ancestry are by their very nature odious to a free people."

Section 360 would deny to certain citizenship claimants the right to enter the United States to prosecute a declaratory action for American citizenship. This would have the result of effectively denying a person his day in court, and since he has no administrative hearing on the question of his citizenship, it is believed that due process would thereby be violated.

Mr. President, these are but a few of the legal points I raise by way of objection to the McCarran bill in its present form. They are, however, points which in my judgment justify the adoption by the Senate of a substitute bill which does not involve any of these legal problems. Then, at a later time, with careful deliberation, we should proceed to fine-tooth comb the McCarran bill from the standpoint of what I think are its many legal defects, eliminate such defects, and then at the next session of the Congress consider and act upon a final bill.

Mr. President, because of some of the points I have made in my remarks, I desire at this time to send to the desk an amendment which later I shall offer to the McCarran bill, if the substitute bill is not adopted. It deals with some of the points I have raised during the course of my remarks.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that in my judgment, our substitute bill covers those aspects and provisions which ought to be considered of immediate concern to the Senate at this session of the Congress, thereby leaving us adequate time in the future to consider other sections of the McCarran bill. I sincerely hope that the substitute bill will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my present purpose to support the substitute bill because I think it is the proper approach to the question. Another reason is that I am one of those who believe profoundly that today the attitude of the United States should be one of extreme helpfulness and friendliness to all people who are resisting totalitarianism and who want to have a haven to which to come. There are a number of persons in my State who have relatives who want to resist totalitarianism, and they desire to know whether, if they do resist, they can come to this country. The only thing that troubles me about the substitute bill is the machinery for determining how the so-called unused quotas will be allocated and whether preference will be given to the type of persons I have mentioned, namely, those who want to get away from totalitarian control. That is the main motivation of my supporting the substitute bill.

Mr. MORSE. That is one of the main motivations for my supporting it. I think it guarantees a fair administrative practice for determining those who can enter this country. I would refer the Senator specifically to the preference section, in which there is language which makes it perfectly clear that the class of persons to whom the Senator from New Jersey has referred will receive preferential treatment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the administration of the law, if the bill is passed, be handled by the State Department or by the Bureau of Immigration?

Mr. MORSE. I understand it will be handled by the present immigration officials.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, following the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, a statement of mine in regard to substitute bill S. 2343.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN IN REGARD TO IMMIGRATION SUBSTITUTE, S. 2343

I wish to speak in favor of the pending substitute, which was formerly S. 2343. With the greatest sincerity and with highest hopes for its passage, I wish to tell you of its virtues.

First, let me say that it is a short bill. It has 8 sections and is printed in 11 pages. Every Senator can read it and understand it at a glance. It is not written with an eye to a detailed and technical revision of the almost innumerable sections in our immigration laws. It chooses those areas most in need of improvement and modification—areas involving the basic principles of our immigration laws—and makes simple, direct, and untechnical changes.

I urge every Senator to read it, or to re-read it, because I know its principles will commend themselves.

Second, it is a bipartisan bill. Even as a recent Member of this body, I know that the best bills are those that transcend partisan lines in their endeavor to better the welfare of all of us. With real pride, I call the roll of those Senators with whom I am associated in sponsoring this bill: The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator

from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

We ask that you give this substitute your earnest consideration.

Let me state the objectives of this bill briefly and then I will touch upon the individual sections. Briefly, this substitute has these objectives: It would eliminate race as a barrier both to naturalization and immigration, it would pool unused quota numbers so that the persecutees and others of Europe could enter this country, without regard to their nationality and under the present limit of 154,000 on total immigration. It would make other reforms by ending outmoded discriminations in immigration—based on sex and by expanding the nonquota and preference claims of the law—to care for parents and close relatives of Americans and for war orphans and veterans. It would also both do justice and benefit our security by permitting the immigration of reformed Communists and Fascists who can prove they are reformed and are now devoted adherents of democracy, as well as those whose entire membership was when they were under 16. Lastly, the bill would revitalize the entire administration of the immigration laws by applying the Administrative Procedure Act to proceedings under the law and by giving statutory powers to the present Board of Immigration Appeals.

The very first section states that the right to become a citizen shall not be denied because of race. We have come a long way from the dark days when we believed that the color of a man's skin had any bearing on his fitness to be a citizen. You might say that we came to the conclusion by repeated illustration. In the dark days at the beginning of World War II we learned that the Filipino people more than deserved equality in citizenship. And we so provided. Later, as the war went on we appreciated that the color of the skin of Chinese and Indians was equally unimportant, and we made them eligible for citizenship. We have not yet recognized in the law that the Japanese who have lived here for over a quarter of a century, industriously and peaceably, patiently awaiting recognition, were equally deserving. There are some 80,000 of such Japanese, who came here before the day of Japanese exclusion. Almost half of them live in Hawaii. Not one of them was disloyal at Pearl Harbor. Their loyalty had not been shaken by exclusion laws and by the laws denying them the brotherhood of citizenship in the country of their home. We should have known before the war that it was only simple justice to allow them to become citizens. Perhaps we did not realize their devotion until their children enrolled themselves in battle. In any event we realize it now and this body has already once approved a bill to grant them citizenship. Unfortunately it was vetoed because it was tied to other provisions. Today we have an opportunity to enact it again, and to make it part of the law.

I cannot pass the question of racial barriers to citizenship without mentioning also that there are residing in the United States a few thousand other Asiatics now ineligible to citizenship. These are Koreans, Siamese and Burmese. It is particularly fitting at this stage of world history to say to all the people of Asia—both those who are friends and enemies—that they are welcome into our community if they are only friendly,

and their good will toward us and their devotion to freedom and democracy are of interest—not at all the color of their skin.

All of these reasons equally require that we eliminate race as a barrier to immigration. It is not enough to say to Asia that those of your people who are within, we admit to equality and those of you who are without, we will keep out. Each country of Asia must be recognized as a member of the world community. We cannot solicit their friendship and at the same time deny them a quota under our immigration laws. At present only the Philippine Islands, China, and India have quotas. In common justice, every single one of the countries of Asia should have its appropriate quota. The pending substitute will accomplish this. The pending substitute will also end the present practice of charging against the Chinese and Indian quotas the descendants of Chinese and Indians who are native-born citizens of other lands.

You will be told that the moment we do this a horde of orientals will swamp the country. This is the same nonsense that many unhappy years ago led us into the Chinese Exclusion Act. We should know better. There are no hordes. The natives of South America and Europe who happen to be of oriental and part-oriental descent are not significantly different from other South Americans or Europeans. The greatest number of them do not wish to immigrate to the United States. All of them will still be subject to all the requirements of our immigration laws such as their ability to support themselves. They will no more engulf us than do the 15,000,000 Mexicans and the millions upon millions of Indians and the other peoples of South America, who can now enter regardless of race and regardless of quotas.

Let us not be put in the impossible position of saying to a man born in Rio de Janeiro that he may not immigrate because his parents or grandparents or great grandparents were born in China, while his neighbors, of Indian or Portuguese or Spanish stock may enter as a Brazilian, entirely free of quota restrictions.

If we apply to all other people the test of place of birth, we cannot apply to these people a test of blood or race or color of skin.

We cannot fool the world. Let us not fool ourselves. If we wish to show our good faith to all of Asia, if we wish to rob the Communists of one of their strongest propaganda weapons in the Far East and wherever in the world there are people with colored skins, if we wish to discard outmoded racist doctrines, if we are not scared of boogies dreamed up by our opponents, then let us wipe out discriminations in our immigration law based on race. Let us do it and let us do a clean and thorough job of it. We cannot fool the world by half measures. Let us not try to fool ourselves.

I turn to the second section of the pending substitute. It offers an equally happy opportunity to combine a permanent reform of lasting value with the solution of the urgent problem of settlement of the persecuted and excess populations of Europe. That problem threatens the well being of the western bloc of free nations, to whose leadership we are devoting unprecedented efforts.

First, let me tell you what this bill would do. Briefly, it provides that the unused quota numbers under the present law—which are about half of the total of 154,000, are to be pooled, and allotted to the people in the countries of Europe and Asia, ranging from Norway and Holland to Germany and Poland and Italy and Greece, who need and want them desperately.

The pooled quota numbers will be distributed by the Secretary of State. Preferences are provided for those who have suffered persecution because of their religion or race or for their opposition to totalitarian-

ism and devotion to democratic beliefs, for those who are the close relatives of citizens and aliens resident in this country, and for those who by reason of their special skills can make special contributions to the national welfare.

The facts of the present emergency in Europe are known to all of us. The Displaced Persons Act has, for practical purposes, expired. It will leave the quotas for the people in need of them mortgaged for decades and centuries to come. Yet the need is compelling. In his message of March 24, the President outlined the facts. There are 9,000,000 ethnic Germans who were driven from Eastern Europe after the war. Fifteen thousand refugees from behind the iron curtain each month steal across the borders to escape to our side. They come at night, on foot, using every stratagem and at the risk of their lives. They come to freedom but they also come to privation. Germany cannot support these people. Trieste, the focal point for the flight from the satellite Balkan countries, is overcrowded. Greece, which receives its own people who flee the Communist countries, is in an equally serious economic plight. These refugees are Balts, and Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Albanians, Ukrainians, and Russians.

Aside from the refugees, we must face the fact that our allies have their own surplus population. Germany, and Italy and Holland and Greece must resettle large numbers of their own people. Present quotas are miserably inadequate for these people.

The quota for Italy is 5,677. For Greece it is 310. The quotas for the smaller Baltic states against which the refugees must be charged, are mortgaged for generations to come.

The Lithuanian quota is mortgaged for 135 years, the Latvian quota for over 300, the Estonian quota for 194 years. The Polish quota is mortgaged until the year 2000.

These people need help now. Plans for gradual immigration must of course be worked out and we shall help in such plans. But today—this year and next—we are organizing the countries of Western Europe in preparation for the world defense of democracy and freedom. These countries are today seriously impeded in their common efforts by the drain of these refugees and excess peoples. We can relieve that pressure by taking some of them. Not only will we help the common defense, we will increase our own abilities. We need the skills and training of these people. We need some of them in our factories. We need many of them on our farms.

By one act—the reception of a number of these people—we can therefore help our allies, help ourselves, and increase our joint capacity to resist Communist aggression.

This emergency situation arises at a time when our quota system is long overdue for reform. In 1924 we fixed the total immigration which we believed this country could absorb at a maximum of 154,000.

We computed the population as 90,000,000 and estimated that new immigration of one-sixth of 1 percent of that figure could each year be absorbed into the population without any dislocations. Our population today is 150,000,000 and by this same formula, we could absorb over 240,000 immigrants each year.

The pending substitute does not, nevertheless, propose any change in the total number of immigrants permissible each year. Some of us believe the limit should be raised but we also recognize that this may not be the unanimous view. We propose, in this substitute, only that the number presently allowable, actually be given quota numbers. We propose that every quota number be used, be put to work.

The quotas for each country established in 1924 have never been used. The largest

quotas went, of course, to the countries whose national stocks then predominated.

The United Kingdom, for instance, received a quota of 65,721, over one-third of the total. That quota reflected the large number in our population of British descent. It also reflected the large number erroneously believed to be of British descent, on the basis of Anglicized family names. The other countries of western and northern Europe also received large quotas—the total is 126,000, while the smaller countries of Southern and Eastern Europe have aggregate quotas of 25,000.

The larger quotas have never been used. Britain last year used only 21,000 of its quota of 66,000. In fact, over all the 27 years of the quota system only 44 percent of the total quotas of 154,000 have actually been used.

Thus we have a situation where those who do not need, have, and those who do need, do not have. It is not only the need of the smaller countries that should impel us to redistribute—to pool—the unused quotas. We must remember that these smaller countries are entitled to a redistribution by the very basis of the quota system. The quotas were fixed according to the proportions of descendants of immigrants in the population in 1920. Since that time it is the Poles and the Greeks and Italians and east European and Balkan peoples who have immigrated. They are now an integral part of our population. They shared with us in our time of trouble and they contributed to our success and victory. They are entitled to a redistribution which will recognize their greater numbers, their greater proportion and representation in the population. Their compatriots in Europe—and in the Middle East—are today entitled to the benefit of such increased quotas.

We will not, by pooling the unused quotas, deprive England and France and the others of their right to use their large quotas. Only to extent of the part not used, would we pool them. We would say that this country is willing, even anxious, to help meet a common problem facing the free world. We would say we are willing and anxious to offer refuge to a victim of communism, to a religious persecutee, to a skilled farmer, to a brother or cousin of a citizen. We would say we will not ask where he was born or whether his country's quota is filled. We would say that so long as the law allows 154,277 immigrants to come each year we want that number to come. If we do this, we will each year strike 154,277 blows in defense of our country today and forever in the future. "New seed" immigration can only continue the beneficial effects we have had from immigration throughout our history. We have grown from a Nation of 4,000,000 people to one of 150,000,000. We are truly the richest and most powerful Nation on the earth. Yet we face the most serious threat imaginable to our existence and that of all of our allies.

We are meeting that threat on all fronts. Let us do it on the front of immigration as well.

I say to you sincerely and humbly that the pooling of quotas proposed by the pending substitute should be enacted in the interest of justice and equality, in the interest of humanity, and in the interest of increasing our national and international strength in our struggle against the dark forces of aggression and brutality whose name is world communism.

I can say all this with such conviction because this pooling of quotas is not merely my proposal. It is not even the proposal only of the 14 distinguished Senators with whom I am joined in sponsoring this bill. It is the enthusiastic and fervent proposal of more than 30 great religious and other organizations. They include the National Council of Churches, the great Protestant organization, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the leading organization among

the Catholics of America interested in this field, and all the national Jewish organizations.

All of these organizations representing every religion and every walk of life cooperated in producing the pending substitute.

There are other provisions of the pending substitute which I commend to your approval.

By this bill we would also solve the problem of reformed totalitarians and those who were members of such organizations when they were children or in circumstances where they were forced to join by law or in order to obtain the necessities of life.

The Internal Security Act barred all totalitarians with no regard to the circumstances of their membership. You will remember our embarrassment as a nation when the Attorney General informed that these provisions excluded some of those reformed Communists who were now powerful enemies of communism. You will remember the harsh and unnecessary effects on some aliens who had joined for a brief period as children or who had been forced to join a Communist organization.

We attempted to remedy some of these harmful and unintended effects when we enacted Public Law 14, early in this session, a year ago March. Section 7 of the pending substitute strengthens Public Law 14 and permits us to welcome, for this strength and help, the reformed Communist. I think it is generally agreed that such an amendment of the law is highly desirable.

Other provisions contain further reforms of the quota and preference systems.

In the days when we did not recognize the equality of women, and we believed that only men traveled and worked and immigrated, the law gave nonquota status and preference under the quotas only to wives of citizens and to wives of resident aliens. Only certain husbands of Americans received such status. We have come to understand that women play a part in world affairs together with men. The women of our armed services alone have taught us that discriminations based on sex are a relic of the past. The women who went into our factories during the war—and who have not left their machines since—have also confirmed this lesson to us. We therefore propose, in the pending substitute, to remove from our immigration law all discrimination based on sex. Wives and husbands, equally, of American citizens would henceforth be nonquota immigrants. Wives and husbands, equally, of resident aliens, will henceforth have preferences under the quotas. This reform, too, is long overdue and I know it meets with widespread approval.

The pending substitute also proposes certain changes in the classes of immigrants who shall have nonquota status. At present, parents of American citizens receive a preference on 50 percent of the quota for the country of their origin. In the countries with the smaller quotas, this preference is insufficient for the number of parents who wish to join their children here. In Norway, for instance, parents of American citizens must wait for 7 years before they receive a quota. And when finally they get to the top of the list of parents, the grant of the preference to them has the effect of leaving no room for other immigrants. The pending substitute will give all parents of American citizens freedom from quota restrictions, on a par with the husbands and wives of citizens. The total number who will be admitted will not be great—it can hardly run to a few thousand. The total in terms of happiness in reunited families will be an everlasting monument to the humanitarianism of this Eighty-second Congress. We also propose that war orphans coming here for adoption and to live with their relatives be admitted on a nonquota basis. The tragic plight of the orphans of Europe is one of the bitterest legacies of the war. They are a

burden on Europe and they could be a blessing to us. They can add to our resources and make hundreds of childless families ecstatically happy. Lastly there are aliens abroad who have served honorably and valuably in our Armed Forces. They have no quota preference, no status. Yet by their service in our Army they have been educated in American democratic ways as no other persons outside this country. Again, we serve ourselves if we bring these people here outside the quota.

With the increase in status of parents, and husbands of American women, we propose that the brothers, sister and adult children, and the parents of resident aliens be given a preference under the quotas.

Lastly, the pending substitute makes a fundamental reform in the administrative procedure under our immigration law. A widely criticized amendment to the law in a recent appropriation act withdrew from immigration proceedings the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act. We know that the rules of fairness embodied in that act are salutary checks on abuses of power by the lesser administrative officers. A fair hearing and a right of appeal to a disinterested superior body are necessary not so much in the interest of the alien who is the subject of an exclusion or deportation proceeding. It is necessary in the interest of preservation of our system of government which demands that laws and not men shall be supreme. Once we deny due process and a fair hearing, we open the door to every possible abuse of power by men in government. Only by constant vigilance can we protect our system of law and that vigilance is to be observed in the field of immigration as well as in the other areas of the activities of the Government.

It is for these reasons that the pending substitute gives statutory powers to the Board of Immigration Appeals rather than the Attorney General as the administrative body charged with review of exclusion proceedings under the immigration laws. The Attorney General is essentially a prosecutor and his subordinates, who actually sit in these proceedings, are thus imbued with the spirit of the prosecutor and not that of the judge. The separation of the function of prosecutor and judge is essential for fairness in administrative proceedings. The pending substitute thus accomplishes this desirable result by recognizing the valuable function performed by the Board of Immigration Appeals, and strengthening that Board with statutory power.

This is what the pending substitute does. I believe all of it is constructive and will improve both our immigration laws and the service they perform in our foreign relations. These improvements—desired and many many years overdue—will demonstrate at home and abroad that we practice democracy and friendship as well as preach it.

They will be worthy of a nation which today is leading the free nations of the world in the struggle for peace and good will.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, during my absence from the Senate floor on Monday a vote to recommit the McCarran bill was taken. I am sorry that I was absent at that time. Had I been present I would have voted for the recommitment of the bill. However, I should like to state that I think the Humphrey-Lehman bill goes a little too far, and that there is a difference of opinion between what is expressed by supporters of the bill and myself as to the rights of aliens in this country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the order be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACTION OF THE AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT UNDER THE TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on April 7, 1952, I stated to the Senate that Mr. John Breckinridge, who represents the California Fig Institute, had alleged to me in writing that the Secretary of Agriculture had disregarded and circumvented the intent of Congress. Mr. Breckinridge outlined his serious charges in some detail through a letter written to me under date of April 5. This Breckinridge letter appears on pages 3610 and 3611 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7. I offered the letter for the RECORD out of a need for fairness to the Department of Agriculture, to the State Department, and to Mr. Breckinridge.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles F. Brannan, has written to me at some length in response to the charges laid before me by Mr. Breckinridge. Because the fig-industry question under discussion is of importance, and because the Secretary of Agriculture ought to be afforded the same opportunity to be heard as was Mr. Breckinridge, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brannan's letter be printed in its entirety at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 16, 1952.

HON. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: In inserting a letter from Mr. John Breckinridge on page 3610 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7 commenting on action taken by me on an application filed by the California Fig Institute under section 8 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, you expressed concern about whether his allegations were based on fact. Because of your understandable concern, I am writing to give you the correct facts for your information and for the RECORD.

I am particularly concerned with Mr. Breckinridge's statement that, in his opinion, I was "forced, in this case, to act on instructions from the State Department and/or the White House." Second, he implies that Mr. Flood, of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, in this Department, was chiefly responsible for my decision. And, third, Mr. Breckinridge attacks my selection of Mr. Flood as Acting Director of the Department's Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations on the grounds that he is an employee of the State Department and, is, therefore, not responsible to me.

Because of your expressed concern as to the accuracy of these allegations, I thought you should be informed that none of them is correct.

First, although we consult other departments when it is appropriate, no one in this department consulted the State Department in this case. I personally made the decision in my capacity as Secretary of Agriculture.

Second, I made this decision after consulting with the heads of all the appropriate agencies in the Department responsible on matters of this type, after a careful study had been made of the entire question. These agencies include the Production and Marketing Administration, which has primary responsibility on section 8 (a) actions, the Solicitor, and the Acting Director of our Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

Third, Mr. Flood's responsibility to Agriculture is so well established, and so well known, that it should need no defense. He was born and reared on the farm, and after finishing university training the only employment he has ever had were these: He homesteaded and farmed in Wyoming; he taught at the Nebraska School of Agriculture and at Iowa State College; he edited midwestern farm magazines for several years; and he came to the United States Department of Agriculture 19 years ago. Since then he has served as Assistant to the Administrator of the AAA, Chester Davis; as Assistant to the War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones; and in this Department's Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. It would be hard to find anyone whose record is more purely agricultural than Mr. Flood's.

In 1947, we recommended Mr. Flood's appointment as agricultural attaché at the United States Embassy in Ottawa, Canada. This was in keeping with our practice of assigning to the Foreign Service able men from the Department of Agriculture to serve as our agricultural attachés instead of relying on nonagricultural men in the Foreign Service. The practice is sound, and has been strongly supported by the House Agriculture Committee and the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations. The assignments and the promotion of these men are now decided primarily on the basis of recommendations of this Department.

At the time of Dr. Henry Bennett's tragic death, Stanley Andrews, the Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, was temporarily detailed to the point 4 program in the State Department. On Mr. Andrews' recommendation, we brought Francis Flood back from his post in Ottawa to direct the work of our Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations during Andrews' absence.

I am sure you will agree that the above information clearly indicates that the statement that I was "forced, in this case, to act on instructions from the State Department and/or the White House" is not based on fact.

Mr. Breckinridge also misrepresented Congressman HUNTER's description of the interview that Mr. HUNTER and Senator NIXON had with Assistant Secretary Hutchinson and Mr. Flood. Congressman Hunter, on seeing Mr. Breckinridge's letter was kind enough to telephone my office and state that the description attributed to him by Mr. Breckinridge was not fully accurate. In the interview Assistant Secretary Hutchinson and Mr. Flood paid tribute to the California Fig Institute for its splendid record of assistance to the fig producers, and agreed with Senator NIXON and Mr. HUNTER that the fig industry is faced with some serious problems. They do not recall that they "expressed grave concern over the welfare of Greece, Turkey, and other fig-exporting countries," as reported by Mr. Breckinridge.

Having indicated to you what we did not do, I know you will be interested in knowing what we did do.

On March 17 the California Fig Institute requested the Secretary of Agriculture to

make a determination under section 8 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 that dried figs are perishable, and that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment by the Tariff Commission of the institute's application for relief under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, which was filed on the same day. Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture makes such a determination under section 8 (a), final action by the Tariff Commission and the President must be taken within 25 days. In substantiation of its request, the institute indicated that dried figs are perishable, that dried-fig imports will be large (6,000 or 7,000 tons) in 1951-52, that these imports are expected to result in a large carry-out in packers' hands, and that this large, unsold tonnage will lead to low grower returns and grower problems in disposing of 1952 crop figs unless imports are controlled for the balance of the 1951 crop year and in 1952-53.

On the basis of the material submitted by the institute and other information available, I determined that the outlook for imports in the balance of the 1951-52 season was not such as to require emergency treatment in the form of an investigation and action within 25 days. Some of the basic facts considered in arriving at this conclusion were these: Dried figs are eligible for consideration under section 8 (a); about 80 percent of imports of dried figs arrive from October to December; as of January 1, 1952, only 300 tons of foreign figs suitable for shipment to the United States during the remainder of the 1951-52 season were available; imports from July 1, 1951, to January 31, 1952, for consumption were only about 3,000 tons (about half the quantity the industry indicated would come in); and domestic shipments of figs so far have been larger than in 1950-51.

The only conclusion we could reach from these facts was that imports during the remainder of the 1951-52 season would be minor, that domestic demand would have to be satisfied almost wholly from domestic sources until the start of the new season, and that therefore a condition requiring emergency treatment did not appear to exist.

We did, however, advise the Tariff Commission on our own initiative that to be of maximum benefit to domestic fig producers any relief under section 7 would have to be granted prior to the industry's new crop year on July 1, 1952. With the expected large carry-over into the 1952 season, domestic dried fig producers could experience substantial hardship if, after July 1, 1952, importers negotiated for and subsequently imported substantial quantities of figs.

My determination was transmitted to the Tariff Commission on April 7, and on the same day I notified Mr. Breckinridge by letter. In addition we informed him we are keeping the problem under surveillance. Needless to say we intend to continue to safeguard the interests of the fig producers as fully as the developing situation and existing legislation permits us to do.

I know that you would want to have the foregoing facts and I will appreciate anything you may do to have them put in the record. I am making copies of this letter available to some of the people who have indicated an interest in the material that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7.

If you should desire any further information on this subject we will be glad to hear from you.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is unnecessary for me to urge the appropriate Senate committee to give consideration

to Mr. Brannan's reaction and response to Mr. Breckinridge's letter and charges. I have reason to believe that the committee will be keenly interested in the correspondence, and will seek to reconcile the serious differences of opinion and even fact which are apparent.

Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the Senator from New York for his courtesy in yielding to me.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, how much time has the Senator from New York remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 17 minutes left.

Mr. BENTON. If I may address a question to the Senator from New York, is my understanding correct that if my remarks require more than 17 minutes, other time will be available?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have been informed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has agreed to give us additional time which he will not use. I can only yield to the Senator pending the appearance on the floor of the Senator from Nevada, but I understand from the Senator from Minnesota that the Senator from Connecticut may have additional time.

Mr. BENTON. I thank the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes have been consumed in the quorum call, which was charged to the side represented by the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I withdrew the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdrew it, but already 9 minutes had been consumed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well. I understand that the Senator from Nevada will grant some of his time to the Senator from Connecticut or other Senators who may wish to speak.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is now conferring with the Senator from Nevada, and I shall proceed on the assumption that the conference will result as indicated by the Senator from New York, so that I will have more time than the 17 minutes.

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 2343, I assert that if there is any measure before the Senate or its committees which would strike a quick and strengthening blow for the democratic principles on which our country was established and has thrived since its inception, it is the substitute bill now before the Senate. It is not pretended that our bill is in any sense a codification or substitute revision of our immigration laws. It is no mass of contamination and discrimina-

tion, no entrenchment of our past mistakes and past evils, no vast confusion confounded. It is not even a paradise for lawyers. It is a simple bill, a bill easy to understand. Indeed, I believe that anyone could achieve understanding of it at one reading.

The passage of our substitute bill, which can be easily and quickly achieved, would show the peoples of the world our good faith in this hour of crisis, and prove to them that we are not deserting them or erecting a barricade or an iron wall to keep out the tragic multitude of alleged untouchables which the McCarran bill would create.

I have spent some time in my State during the past week. As Senators may know, the complexion of my State has changed very greatly in the past 100 years. I spoke at a communion breakfast in New Haven on Sunday morning, and discovered from the priest, Father McDonough, that the first Catholic parish in the city of New Haven—and perhaps in the State of Connecticut—was founded in 1851. My father was born in Connecticut in 1850, 1 year before the first Catholic parish was established in the city of New Haven. Today, Bishop O'Brien tells me, 38 percent of my constituents are Catholics.

Something like 60 percent of the people of my State of Connecticut had left Connecticut and gone west before the Civil War. As a young man in his thirties, my father, the eighth generation to be born in the State, left to teach at the University of Minnesota. Such people who went west have been replaced through the great emigration from Europe, until today perhaps two-thirds of the population of my State consists of the various groups which have come in from Europe during the past century—or a little more—the Irish, the Italians, the Czechs, the Germans, the Poles, the Slovaks, the Carpatho-Russians, and many, many others.

As a result of this melting pot within my own State there is great interest in the pending bill. I say to Senators who have not had an opportunity to get home during this debate that they will find in their States a greater interest in the pending bill on the part of various racial groups than they may now suspect. On Monday night I spoke to 800 or 900 delegates at the New Haven convention of the Democratic Party. When, as a part of my talk, I came to the subject of the current debate on the floor of the Senate, I could feel the response of that audience. I could literally see the audience coming to attention when I started to talk about the bill. Thus the pending bill is of tremendous concern to large groups of our own population.

I warn Senators who have not properly read the bill, thought about the bill, or studied the bill, or who have not been back home in contact with their constituents, that if they are prepared to support and vote for the McCarran bill they will hear a great deal about it later from certain groups of their constituents who have a real interest and a real basis, out of their experience, for understanding the nature of the tragic problem.

This is a far more important subject than most of our colleagues realize. It

is of concern to large numbers of informed constituents who boast a deep interest in the subject, growing out of their personal and family backgrounds. I find as great an interest in the bill in my State as I have found in any other bill which has been debated on the floor of this body. The newspapers do not reflect the interest which I find personally when I return to the State.

Secondly, the bill is of even greater concern to the relatives and kinfolk of these people overseas. All over the world the eyes of the peoples of foreign countries are focused on the United States. They are interested in what we are going to do about the pending bill. Shortly we shall be debating an appropriation of \$6,900,000,000 for mutual aid. On the one hand, we are pouring out our treasure and raising our taxes in order to win the respect, admiration, friendship, and support of the peoples of other nations. On the other hand, by the passage of this one bill we can destroy much of the good will which we otherwise would be achieving with these vast expenditures of money and of blood. Nothing can be more inconsistent than for us to pass the pending bill while at the same time we face growing casualty lists in the Korean war.

I do not believe that many Members of the Senate could possibly have read Senate bill 2550. It requires days to read. I assure Senators that it will take the most expert lawyers weeks and years to understand it. It is 302 pages of verbose, complicated, confused elaboration of what, in my judgment, need only be a simple code covering our immigration and nationality procedures. The immigration and nationality laws of Canada consist of less than 75 pages. They can be read and understood by the average intelligent layman after a single evening of study.

Senate bill 2550, the McCarran bill, is so obtuse that the Senator from Nevada seems to have decided not to explain it to us section by section, as I thought he had agreed to do when the debate on the bill began. Perhaps if he should attempt to explain the bill to us section by section, as he explained the then pending bill before the passage of the Administrative Procedure Act, it would take him so long, and the explanation would be so involved, that he would be accused of engaging in a filibuster.

Mr. President, I submit that we should not enact legislation which is incapable of being read and understood by the majority of the Members of the United States Senate, particularly when the majority consists of lawyers who, in theory, have spent their lives preparing to understand such legislation. I feel that this is particularly true when experienced Senators—such as our colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]—who have studied this bill warn us that it is not only undemocratic but potentially highly dangerous.

Mr. President, no man can calculate the billions which we would have to spend on armaments to achieve a measure of security comparable to what would be added to our security by the defeat of the McCarran bill and the acceptance of this substitute. If we are

talking about the McCarran bill in terms of our national security, it can be calculated in terms of billions of dollars of damage to the security of the people of the United States. Yes, there are other things involved in our security besides airplanes, atomic bombs, and armaments. What good will it do to arm the peoples of Europe if they do not have the spirit to fight alongside us? In Southeast Asia we have seen armies which on many occasions seemingly have lacked spirit. In China, into which we poured \$3,000,000,000 or more of armaments, we saw the Nationalist armies lacking the spirit to fight and to use those armaments. It is measures such as the bill we are now debating, the 302-page immigration bill, which destroy the confidence of the world in us, in our democratic principles, and in our leadership.

Mr. President, I should be surprised to learn that the bill has been read or analyzed by more than a handful of Members of this body. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, told a group of us the other day that the committee itself had never adequately studied the bill, and that it was the work, over a period of time, of the staff, and of a few members of a subcommittee.

Why should we pass this bill this year at this explosive time in world history? There is no pressing need to "codify" or "revise" our immigration laws this year. We should never do it in the manner proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I say let us have no alleged revision or alleged codification which for one minute tolerates such a shameful example of tragic, short-sighted foolishness as is embodied in S. 2550.

Mr. President, the McCarran bill is offensive to hundreds of millions of people all over the world. Yet our immigration laws need not be endlessly and foolishly offensive.

In 1950 we enacted the Internal Security Act, which was intended to deal with the security problems surrounding aliens and citizens alike. The present Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as an ex-member of a university faculty, must have been embarrassed, as I too was embarrassed as an ex-member of a university faculty, by the recent incident in New York dealing with a scientific group whose name escapes me. The scientific society could not meet in New York and had to change its place of meeting to Canada because of the provisions of the internal security law.

I cite that incident if only to show that the Security Act is certainly doing a job in this Nation and that the Nation is not in any danger from a stream of subversives and Communists coming in as immigrants. That incident shows that the welfare of the Nation is in no way at stake if we do not enact immigration legislation this year. On the other

hand, the future basis for maintaining our newly gained stature as a world leader would be greatly, adversely, and tragically affected by the passage of the McCarran bill.

Mr. President, the world is too full of folly, deception, and treachery already, without this country instituting a basic law which reeks with unjust and arbitrary inequities in the tradition of a completely foreign concept, to the effect that one race is better than another; for example that a German is better than a Greek or an Italian.

I may say that in my own State of Connecticut, in line with comments that I have just made about the racial groups in my State, and as our civil-rights legislation and the enforcement of our FEPC law in Connecticut demonstrate, there is no basic difference between a German, an Italian, a Ukrainian, a Greek, a Norwegian, an Englishman, or an Irishman. These prejudices, which grow out of our past, and which are ingrained in the McCarran bill, are in defiance of the democratic principles which we are practicing in the State of Connecticut and to which we give allegiance throughout our country.

Mr. President, our proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute affords a real opportunity to improve our immigration practices, to remove racial and sex discriminations from our immigration laws, and to permit for the first time an equitable approach to our quota system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired. It is the understanding of the Chair that an agreement has been reached between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Minnesota with respect to the remainder of the time. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to state that agreement for the information of the Chair?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have just discussed the matter with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I have spoken to him with reference to the use of the remainder of the time for debate available between now and 4:30, when the vote is to be taken on the substitute. The Senator from Nevada informs me that he wishes to begin his remarks at approximately 3 o'clock. He expects to speak for an hour and 15 minutes. In that way he would utilize the remainder of the time available for debate, and then a quorum call would be had at the conclusion of his remarks. He suggested to me that we utilize the time between now and 3 o'clock. With that understanding I yield an additional 15 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair takes note of the understanding. The Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BENTON. I thank the Chair and I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I know that the Senator from Nevada seeks to accomplish some of what I have

just described in his own 302-page bill and that the bill incorporates a few good provisions along with many bad ones.

Mr. President, our substitute, S. 2343, accomplishes needed revision in 10 or 11 pages, and does it in direct language and in a manner which requires no legal adviser at one's side as he reads each word. It can be easily explained section by section. It is a bill which has six simple objectives. I should like to review the six objectives very quickly at this point.

First, it removes racial discrimination from our immigration and naturalization laws. That is our greatest and most crying need. We must do that if we are to practice what we preach. If we want to give the Voice of America something to talk about all over the world all we have to do is to remove racial discrimination from our immigration laws. This would be a tremendous step forward for the people of the United States in our great effort to take world leadership.

All pending immigration bills claim this as an objective. All theoretically agree that race should play no part in determining whom we shall admit to our shores or our citizenry. The removal of this sore spot from our laws will have a favorable effect upon our international relations throughout the world, particularly in the Far East, where the American antioriental exclusion policy has long been resented.

Once before I mentioned on the floor that I happened to be in Japan in 1937 on the anniversary date of the passage of our Oriental Exclusion Act. I had never heard anything about it until I got to Japan. I certainly heard about it that day, because black flags broke out all over Tokyo. Black flags adorned the buildings. Japan proclaimed a national day of mourning. This would have been avoided by the admission under our quota system of something like 143 Japanese a year.

Mr. President, no man knows the extent to which this Oriental Exclusion Act precipitated the climate of opinion in Japan which brought about the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Every student of history admits that it had tremendous effect. For all we know, it may have been responsible for the attack on Pearl Harbor. What a price to pay for the exclusion of 143 Japanese a year. The McCarran bill would permit the entry of 100 Japanese a year. Thus it takes some of the taint of racial exclusion, so far as the Japanese are concerned, out of our immigration laws.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; on the Senator's time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well. I may say to the Senator that the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is the pending question, clearly and irrevocably removes from the immigration laws any shadow or any trace of oriental racial discrimination, and that there is

no doubt that Senators who are concerned, as the Senator from Connecticut is concerned, about the Japanese exclusion, will find it removed under the terms of the substitute which has been offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. BENTON. That is the first and the most important point of our six basic and simple objectives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad the Senator from Connecticut refers to the objectives as simple and basic. That is what they are. There is involved no grandiose rewriting of our immigration laws.

Mr. BENTON. We do not propose to throw over the limitation on the quotas. Perhaps at some future time men of more courage and men who are less practical than we are will be willing to attempt it. However, we have only these six basic and simple objectives. I have given the first—the elimination of racial discrimination.

Second, the substitute bill would remove discriminations based upon sex. Why should we in the United States, to whom the whole world looks with favor because of our attitude toward our women, why should we, after our record of leadership in giving full rights to women, why should we practice discrimination against women in our immigration laws?

An American husband today can bring his foreign wife into the United States as a nonquota immigrant. He can bring her in immediately as a nonquota immigrant. Any German girl who wishes to enter the United States merely has to marry one of our soldiers who is stationed in Germany, or any other American she can persuade; and in that event she will enter the United States, regardless of the date of marriage or regardless of the quota. However, when an American girl marries an alien, she can secure for him only a preference under the quota.

Incidentally, Mr. President, today the preference quotas for Turkey, Greece, and certain other countries are greatly oversubscribed. So if an American girl marries a Greek, for instance, she will be in the unhappy position of being unable to have him admitted to the United States; even if his name is Skouras, she will be unable to have him admitted to the United States. [Laughter.]

The American wife of a Turkish or a Greek or many another national must remain in the United States, separated from her husband, or must leave the land of her birth, to live abroad, waiting until her husband's number shows up on the quota list.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at this point?

Mr. BENTON. I yield. I can see that the heart of the Senator from Minnesota is wrong by the predicament of American girls who marry aliens.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. So the Senator from Connecticut is really saying that if a young man from the United States in his travels about Europe finds there a charming young damsel who

meets his fancy, he can marry her and can bring her home immediately to the United States, to be his "one and only."

Mr. BENTON. Yes; at once he can "bring her home to mother."

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, if a young American girl meets in Europe a young, gallant, gentlemanly, chivalrous young man of powerful physique, for instance, and if she marries him, she will have to wait until he can qualify under the immigration quota, before he will be admitted to the United States. Is not that a fact?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; unfortunately, that is true under present conditions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In fact, in some cases her charming husband might have to wait until the year 2000. By that time he might not be so gallant or so charming or of such powerful physique. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, in the case of an American girl who marries a Turk, for instance, she should make sure that he is a very, very, very young Turk. [Laughter.]

Mr. BENTON. Of course, Mr. President, if an American girl marries a Turk, I think he should be a young one anyway.

Our amendment would remove the discrimination based upon sex, and thus would implement the underlying intention of our immigration laws, in seeking the preservation of the family unit.

Our amendment also contains humane provisions for granting nonquota status to war orphans and to aliens who served in our Armed Forces.

The Senator from Minnesota and I have been particularly interested, over a period of years, in the subject of alien orphans. The war has left in its wake thousands of war orphans, who can find decent homes in the United States and can grow up here to become patriotic and loyal American citizens. These children have suffered not only from the ravages of war, but also from the tragedies which befall innocent youngsters when they lose their parents. These blameless and homeless orphans should not be compelled to stand in quota lines if they are otherwise admissible to the United States under our laws.

Mr. President, as a member of the board of trustees of the Cradle Society, of Evanston, Ill., I can tell you that there are in the United States tens of thousands of families who would immediately line up at the docks at the ports in the United States to wait for these children. Yes; America has hundreds of thousands of empty homes seeking and wanting children. In fact, Mr. President, the quota of babies at the Cradle Society is oversubscribed for a decade—so much so that I constantly receive calls from persons who know friends of mine, or from persons who know friends of friends, who seek me out as one of the members of the board

of trustees of the Cradle Society; and those calls are always, in substance, as follows: "Can't you be of some help? I am told that I must wait 10 years before I can get a baby."

In fact, Mr. President, in the United States there are countless empty homes in which the success of the marriage may depend upon obtaining a baby. So here we have this great gaping market for babies in the United States.

Mr. President, as an ex-businessman, perhaps I may use business terms and say that there is a great supply of babies in Europe, and we should permit the supply to come together with the demand. That is needed in order to avert a tragedy not only for the homeless orphans of Europe, but also for hundreds of thousands of empty homes in the United States.

I speak on this subject with special feeling because, as many of you may know, three of Mrs. Benton's and my own four children are adopted children. That is how I became interested in this subject to begin with.

If the couples who are childless, or who have only one child and want more, knew they could get babies, those couples would come forward from virtually every block in every city and town in the country, in numbers that could not be believed except by persons who have had experience in this field and who know the great desire on the part of, I suspect, American families running into the millions. Yes, Mr. President, I have understated the case when I have said that the demand comes only from hundreds of thousands of families. It is from millions.

Accordingly, our amendment contains a provision granting nonquota status to these orphans.

An authorization for the admission of 10,000 war orphans was permitted under the amended Displaced Persons Act, to begin in June 1950, and to terminate by June 30, 1952. Although the authorization calls for a total of 10,000, the Displaced Persons Commission will be able to process only 4,000 by the expiration date of June 30. The reasons for this situation are multiple. For one thing, it has taken a long time for many of the foreign governments in question to gain confidence in the program and to release appropriate children for processing. I recall that when I was in London, last October, an American motion-picture actress, whose name I have forgotten, was there; and a big story in the British press was the British Government's determination to keep her from taking back to the United States a British baby only a few months old. Many foreign governments are not willing to let children leave their countries. The complications of their laws and the adjustment of our complicated laws to their laws constitute one of the reasons why more foreign-born babies have not been processed under this act for admission to the United States. Furthermore, the adoption procedures in our own country, which vary from State to State, must be adjusted in order to meet the laws of

foreign countries. That process has been slow and cumbersome. In addition, children cannot be brought into most of our States without compliance of the prospective parents, and this takes time.

Because of the June 30 expiration date, more than 6,000 orphans will be excluded from the United States, although under the original authorization the intent of Congress was to have them included and admitted.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will assure me that I shall have an additional 5 minutes in which to address the Senate, I shall read some very touching excerpts from some of the letters I have received. On the other hand, if the time is too limited for that, I shall ask that some of the letters be printed in the RECORD, in addition to those I shall read.

Suppose at this time I read one letter, as a sample. If time remains, thereafter, for me to read others, I shall do so. Of course, I shall not read the names given in the letters, because I do not think that would be suitable:

MAY 8, 1952.

MR. E. M. O'CONNOR,
*Commissioner of Displaced Persons,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In regard to your letter of April 29, 1952, concerning D. P. C. 224—

Mr. President, some child was given that number, like a convict—

I was in Greece in December 1951 and saw with my own eyes the poverty, bomb-torn homes, broken families, sickness, and despair. I am heartsick. These two girls, Eléne and Gianoula, are actually sleeping on the ground—no beds, no floor, no shoes, very few clothes, and only makeshift food, with no way of helping themselves and no one else to help them. It is inhuman to leave them to shift for themselves as animals would. Even with the help I could give them from here, it would by no means answer the problem.

I have a home, a steady job, and every intention of doing as much for these girls, who are my blood relations, as I would for our own children. Our children are grown now. Our only daughter is married. We have three sons: Robert is in the Army; Clifford has had his physical examination and is waiting to be called into the Army; and Lee intends to join the Navy. So there will be no reason why these orphans, who have known only the misery of life amidst war could not have a real home and the guidance and help they so desperately need.

While I am not unmindful of the big job you and your organization are doing, I still hope you will find an opportunity to allow Eléne and Gianoula * * * to enter the United States and become the useful, happy people they are capable of being with the necessary help.

Respectfully yours,

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes more.

MR. BENTON. Mr. President, instead of reading any more letters, I ask unani-

mous consent that any other letters which I may desire to have included in the RECORD may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. BENTON. Mr. President, let me review rather quickly the other basic, simple objectives of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The third objective of our amendment in the nature of a substitute is to pool unused quotas for distribution during the following year. These would be distributed without reference to national origin. They could be used to reunite close relatives or to secure the entry of persons who would enhance our national security and economy, or who seek asylum here because of religious, racial, or political persecution.

Mr. President, no other country in the Western Hemisphere, and perhaps no other country in the world, has immigration laws as stringent as those of the United States. Very few countries in this hemisphere have any quota laws at all. Brazil has a flexible quota system which permits the transfer of unfilled quotas to a subsequent year, just as we propose in our amendment in the nature of a substitute. Canada and Mexico have no quota laws, but may impose numerical limitations upon immigration by executive action, when deemed necessary. That system is far more flexible than ours. Peru limits the number of aliens in its country at any one time. That limitation is designed to curtail Asiatic immigration. Britain, France, Sweden, and China have no quota laws, no literacy tests, and no laws which exclude aliens because of race or nationality.

Mr. President, we can and do propose to continue to maintain a quota system in our substitute and restrict aliens numerically. But we most surely should do so only upon the basis of a democratic and flexible quota system which does not discriminate against people because of the color of their face or the alleged color of their blood. We should not continue to seemingly waste quota numbers each year—when in reality we are killing them—when they can be pooled and distributed during the following year to reunite families, to assist refugees from communism and other forms of totalitarianism and to bring to the United States skills and professions which will be of benefit to our country.

There was a time when a citizen who fled from persecution or tyranny in his own country could escape to a new world there to make valuable contributions to the welfare and history of a new democratic republic. That is the way we grew and became great. But today, in the year 1952, when travel is so swift and easy and when great governments are ostensibly and ostentatiously engaged in the work of international organization, a man who loses his country loses his place in the world, too. As a stateless person he has no status in the world community. On December 22, 1946, the Age-Herald of Birmingham,

Ala., commented upon this problem, and the comment is so appropriate that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There was a day when the United States took pride in being a haven for worthy folk who wished to better themselves. Is that day passing?

If so, it is quite an irrational development. Most of us are descendants of foreigners. * * * If we are to be a good neighbor to the rest of mankind we cannot maintain this forbidding role. The time has come to remodel our immigration policy so that it will conform not to our fears but to our resources and our hopes.

MR. BENTON. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two case stories citing examples wherein the application of present immigration regulations would split families by admitting one or more members of the family, but not all members, to the United States.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. A Czechoslovakian refugee family, personally known to and recommended by a Foreign Service officer who recently served in Czechoslovakia, is now in Liverpool. The family consists of a mother, father, and a daughter who has just passed her twenty-first birthday. The daughter happens to have been born in Budapest.

While it seems likely that the parents might be eligible for immigration visas within a reasonable length of time, the daughter would not be able to accompany them because her visa would be chargeable only to the now heavily oversubscribed Hungarian quota.

2. Mr. and Mrs. Sans, their 24-year-old son and their daughter, were Latvian DP's in Germany. Mr. and Mrs. Sans and their daughter were admitted to the United States under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act and are now living in Grand Rapids, Mich. According to Mr. Sans, the son was refused admission on the grounds that he had lost his DP status because he had left the DP camp in Germany and spent a year in Belgium working as a miner.

MR. BENTON. Mr. President, this amendment would pool our quotas for the next succeeding year to enable us to continue to be a haven for the worthy folk who wish to better themselves and who can contribute to our country by making our democracy stronger and greater. This amendment would make our quota system flexible in accordance with our resources and our hopes. This amendment would insure a democratic and just quota system in accordance with our history and traditions.

Fourth. Our bill, S. 2343, now pending before the Senate, would establish a statutory Board of Immigration Appeals. The Board was originally established in 1922 when it was known as the Board of Review. For 2 years the Secretary of Labor made a study of the Immigration

and Naturalization Service and in 1940 recommended that a Board be established devoted solely to quasi-judicial functions. The present Board of Immigration Appeals was established by Justice Jackson, when he was Attorney General to fulfill the recommendations of that 2-year study. In its recent report on H. R. 5678, the so-called Walter omnibus bill, the House Committee had this to say—House Report No. 1365, pages 35-36:

It is believed that the Board has well served its purpose and has greatly contributed to a fair and equitable administration of justice in immigration, nationality, and naturalization cases.

When the Walter omnibus bill was debated on the floor of the House, an amendment was approved to establish a statutory Board of Immigration Appeals—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4401, April 24, 1952. Today, the Board is a nonstatutory Board, subject to the control of the Attorney General. Our bill proposes to make this a statutory Board, so that it cannot be abolished summarily at his whim or caprice. The American Friends Service Committee, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and other organizations have recommended that the Board of Immigration Appeals be given stature and permanence so that it can continue to contribute to the fair and impartial administration of our immigration and nationality laws. This should be done by making the Board a statutory body as has been done by the omnibus immigration bill which has passed the House of Representatives on April 25.

Fifth. S. 2343 would permit the entry into the United States of reformed members of totalitarian parties, whose past membership was involuntary or who have since been actively opposed to the doctrines of such totalitarian organizations of which they were members. This provision is similar to the provision contained in S. 2550 at pages 60 and 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield one more minute to the Senator, in order that he may complete his remarks,

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I understand that this provision is strongly endorsed by the State Department. Is it not manifestly in our own best interests to encourage defections from the ranks of communism and other forms of totalitarianism? When a person has deserted communism or other forms of totalitarianism, and given satisfactory proof of his active opposition to such dogma, and when his entry into the United States has been approved both by the State Department and the Attorney General, there is no reason why he should be barred from asylum in the United States. Our bill provides an added protection in connection with this provision. Each such case which is approved administratively, must be reported to Congress.

The foregoing provision, which is also proposed by the omnibus bill itself, was found desirable as a result of experiences under the operation of the Internal Security Act amendments to our immigration laws. We found ourselves excluding from entry into the United States many proven cases of anti-Communists under a law which was intended to exclude subversives. It nearly stopped all immigration from Italy. It prevented bona fide iron-curtain refugees from entering the United States solely because at one time in the past they have been compelled to be members of Communist organizations. It is for this reason that the Senator from Nevada is in agreement with us that this provision of law is necessary to correct injustice and to treat anti-Communists fairly and properly.

Sixth. Finally, the amendment would restore the Administrative Procedure Act. The Senator from Nevada, who played such a distinguished role in developing the Administrative Procedure Act, in his omnibus immigration bill seeks to accomplish this same purpose. However, the American Bar Association believes that his bill fails to do so. In simple, unmistakable language, our amendment accomplishes what the Senator from Nevada attempts to do in the course of his 302 pages, but may not have achieved. The Administrative Procedure Act was designed to bring im-

partial administrative justice to Government agencies, to prevent the same man from being prosecutor and judge, from being investigator one day and a judge the next. The McCarran bill would permit commingling of functions by not requiring a complete separation between prosecutor and judicial functions in the immigration service and by not providing for independent examiners who are not subject to supervisors who engage in such investigating or prosecuting functions. S. 2343 maintains the impartial justice required of administrative agencies by the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. President, S. 2343, which is in the nature of a substitute, would revise the immigration and naturalization laws to accomplish needed reforms. It would do it in simple language which everyone can understand. It would do it in a proposal without hidden booby traps. Whatever is proposed in our bill is out in the open where it can be seen by all. Our bill does not claim to be one thing and turn out to be another. If my colleagues here today are really interested in removing discriminations from our immigration and naturalization laws and in the fair administration of these laws, they should vote for this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], I desire to have placed in the RECORD a comparison of the bills, S. 2550 and S. 2842, the latter of which bills is pending before the Judiciary Committee, in reference to the treatment of subversives in the respective bills. There has been considerable comment as to what Senate bill 2842 would do, and I have had an analysis made of the two bills which contains all pertinent information. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I think the RECORD will bear me out that S. 2842 is very rigid in its terms and surely protects the full national interest of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Treatment of subversives in the omnibus immigration bills

EXCLUSIONS PROVISIONS

Section	Under S. 2550 (McCarran)	Under S. 2842 (Humphrey-Lehman)	Remarks
Sec. 212 (a) (27).....	Aliens who the consular officer or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe seek to enter	Aliens who seek to enter	Both bills set up the same requirements. However, while S. 2550 permits a determination to be made on the basis of the consul's or the Attorney General's "reason to believe", S. 2842 sets up an objective standard which gives reviewing authorities greater latitude.
<i>Common to both bills</i>			
	the United States solely, principally, or incidentally to engage in activity which would be prejudicial to the public interest, or endanger the welfare, safety, or security of the United States;		
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (A).....	Aliens who are anarchists;		Sections same in both bills.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (B).....	Aliens who advocate or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches, opposition to all organized government;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (i).....	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with the Communist Party of the United States;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (ii).....	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with any other totalitarian party of the United States;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (iii).....	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with the Communist Political Association;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (iv).....	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with the Communist or any other totalitarian party of any State of the United States, or any foreign state, or of any political or geographical subdivision of any foreign state;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (v).....	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with any section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision of any such association or party;		Do.

Treatment of subversives in the omnibus immigration bills—Continued

EXCLUSIONS PROVISIONS—continued

Section	Under S. 2550 (McCarran)	Under S. 2842 (Humphrey-Lehman)	Remarks
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (vi).....	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with the direct predecessors or successors of any such association or party.	(No corresponding provision in this bill).....	This provision of S. 2550 serves no useful purpose. A successor to a Communist association will always be another Communist association by a different name. A member of such a successor association would, therefore be barred under the previous subsection. On the other hand, a predecessor to a Communist association would often be a non-Communist association which was taken over by the Communists. The Communists, who shared in the association after it was taken over would be barred under the previous subsections. What subsection (vi) would do is bar the anti-Communist who got out when the Communists took over. Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (D).....	Aliens not within any of the other provisions of this paragraph who advocate the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, either through its own utterances or through any written or printed publications issued or published by or with the permission or consent of or under the authority of such organization or paid for by the funds of, or funds furnished by, such organization;		
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (E).....	Aliens not within any of the other provisions of this paragraph, who are members of or affiliated with any organization during the time it is registered or required to be registered under section 7 (b) of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, unless such aliens establish that they did not have knowledge or reason to believe at the time they became members of or affiliated with such an organization (and did not thereafter and prior to the date upon which such organization was so registered or so required to be registered have such knowledge or reason to believe) that such organization was a Communist organization;		
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (F).....	Aliens who advocate or teach or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates (i) the overthrow by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (ii) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character; or (iii) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (iv) sabotage;		Section identical in both bills.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (G).....	Aliens who write or publish, or cause to be written or published, or who knowingly circulate, distribute, print, or display, or knowingly cause to be circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or who knowingly have in their possession for the purpose of circulation, publication, distribution, or display, any written or printed matter, advocating or teaching (i) the overthrow by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (ii) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government because of his or their official character; or (iii) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (iv) sabotage; or (v) the economic, international and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship;	Aliens who, in pursuance of any activities specified in subparagraphs (A) through (F),	The word "knowingly" as used in S. 2550 might mean that a person can be excluded for the acts listed as long as he knows that he is distributing, printing, etc., even if he doesn't have the slightest idea of the contents of the material. S. 2842 merely clarifies this section by spelling out the fact that the people to be excluded are those that engage in subversive activities. It protects the innocent man who is hired to deliver packages the contents of which he doesn't know.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (H).....	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with any organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes or displays, or causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, or display, any written or printed matter of the character described in paragraph (G);	Aliens who, in pursuance of any activities specified in subparagraphs (A) through (F),	The difference between S. 2550 and S. 2842 in this section is the same as in (G). The innocent man who belongs to a delivery service or printing firm that handles subversive material but who has no knowledge of the contents of that material is protected.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (I).....	Any alien who is within any of the classes described in subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), and (H), of this paragraph because of membership in or affiliation with a party or organization or a section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision thereof, may, if not otherwise ineligible, be issued a visa if such alien establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer when applying for a visa and the consular officer finds that (i) such membership or affiliation is or was involuntary,	Any alien who is within any of the classes described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), and (H),	S. 2842 gives a former anarchist the same standing as a former Communist or other totalitarian while S. 2550 has no redeeming provision for former anarchists. This may be an oversight in S. 2550.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (1).....	(No corresponding provision.)	or without knowledge of the aims or purposes of such party, organization, section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision,	S. 2842 excuses former members of subversive organizations who can show that at the time of membership they had no knowledge of the aims and purposes of the organization.
	or is or was solely when under sixteen years of age, by operation of law, or for purposes of obtaining employment, food rations, or other essentials of living and where necessary for such purposes, or (ii) (a) since the termination of such membership or affiliation, such alien is and has been, for at least five years prior to the date of the application for a visa, actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles, and ideology of such party or organization or the section, subsidiary, branch, or affiliate or subdivision thereof, and (b) the admission of such alien into the United States would be in the public interest.	would not be against the public interest.	The purpose of this entire exemption is to permit involuntary and reformed members of totalitarian organizations to enter this country. Often they will be relatives of American citizens, who have no special claim to fame, no outstanding qualifications. They could not prove that their immigration would actually be "in the public interest" if that provision is applied liberally. In those cases it would be fairer and more reasonable to require that their admission be not against the public interest.
	Any such alien to whom a visa has been issued under the provisions of this subparagraph may, if not otherwise inadmissible, be admitted into the United States if he shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General when applying for admission to the United States and the Attorney General finds that (i) such membership or affiliation is or was involuntary, or is or was solely when under sixteen years of age, by operation of law, or for purposes of obtaining employment, food rations, or other essentials of living and where necessary for such purposes, or (ii) (a) since the termination of such membership or affiliation, such alien is and has been, for at least five years prior to the date of the application for admission, actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles, and ideology of such party or organization or the section, subsidiary, branch, or affiliate or subdivision thereof, and (b) the admission of such alien into the United States would be in the public interest. The Attorney General shall promptly make a detailed report to the Congress in the case of each alien who is or shall be admitted into the United States under (ii) of this subparagraph;		

Treatment of subversives in the omnibus immigration bills—Continued

Section	Under S. 2550 (McCarran)	Under S. 2842 (Humphrey-Lehman)	Remarks
Sec. 212 (a) (29)-----	<p>Aliens with respect to whom the consular officer or the Attorney General knows or has reasonable ground to believe probably would, after entry,</p> <p>(A) engage in activities which would be prohibited by the laws of the United States relating to espionage, sabotage, public disorder, or in other activity subversive to the national security, (B) engage in activity a purpose of which is the opposition to, or the control or overthrow of, the Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means, or</p> <p>(C) join, affiliate with, or participate in the activities of any organization which is registered or required to be registered under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950;</p>	<p>Aliens with respect to whom there are reasonable grounds for believing that such aliens would, after entry,</p> <p>(No corresponding provision)</p>	<p>S. 2842 sets up an objective reviewable standard in this case, where S. 2550 permits the Consul or Attorney General to speculate as to the alien's state of mind.</p> <p>S. 2842 bars members of Communist and other totalitarian parties and of Communist-front organizations. It also bars aliens of whom there are reasonable grounds of believing that they would in the future join Communist or other totalitarian organizations. However, to bar aliens who in the future might join Communist-front organizations would set up too vague and unenforceable a standard and give too much discretionary power to administrative officials.</p>

DEPORTATION PROVISIONS

Sec. 241 (a) (6)-----	<p>Any alien in the United States (including an alien crewman), shall, upon the order of the Attorney General, be deported who—</p> <p>is or at any time after entry has been a member of any one of the classes of aliens described in paragraph (28) of section 212 (a) of this title, except that this paragraph shall not apply to an alien who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence if the conduct, membership, or affiliation which caused the alien to be a member of any such classes</p> <p>ceased to exist prior to such lawful entry into the United States;</p> <p>(No corresponding provision)</p>	<p>has ceased to exist, or</p> <p>(B) to an alien deportable under this paragraph solely by reason of present membership in, or affiliation with, an organization described in paragraph (28) (E) of such section, if such alien does not have knowledge or reason to believe that such organization is a Communist organization, and if, within a reasonable time after the commencement of the deportation proceedings, such alien terminates such membership or affiliation, or</p> <p>(C) to an alien deportable under this paragraph solely by reason of past membership in, or affiliation with, an organization described in paragraph (28) (E) of such section, if such alien terminated such membership or affiliation within a reasonable time after acquiring knowledge or reason to believe that such organization was a Communist organization;</p>	<p>S. 2550 provides for the deportation of aliens who after their entry into the United States participated in subversive activities, even if such activities ceased long ago. S. 2842 provides for the deportation of persons presently engaged in subversive activities.</p> <p>S. 2842 gives a person who can show that he was duped into joining a Communist-front organization without knowing of its aims and of the fact that it was so listed a chance to resign within a reasonable time after deportation proceedings have been commenced.</p> <p>S. 2842 gives a person who can show that he was duped into joining a Communist-front organization without knowing of its aims and of the fact that it was so listed and who learned the truth just before deportation proceedings were started a chance to clear himself by resigning.</p>
Sec. 241 (a) (7)-----	<p>is engaged, or at any time after entry has engaged, or at any time after entry has had a purpose to engage, in any of the activities described in paragraph (27) or (29) of section 212 (a), unless the Attorney General is satisfied, in the case of any alien within category (C) of paragraph (29) of such section, that such alien did not have knowledge or reason to believe at the time such alien became a member of, affiliated with, or participated in the activities of the organization (and did not thereafter and prior to the date upon which such organization was registered or required to be registered under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 have such knowledge or reason to believe) that such organization was a Communist organization;</p>	<p>has been convicted of engaging in any of the activities described in paragraph (27) or (29) of section 212 (a);</p>	<p>These essential differences between S. 2550 and S. 2842 on this point is that S. 2550 grants broad discretionary powers to administrative officials in determining whether a person has a purpose to engage in prejudicial activities while S. 2842 requires that he shall have been convicted in a court of law before he can be deported.</p>

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate are aware, the present quota system is based upon the alleged proportions which the various national groups formed of the total white population in 1920, within an over-all immigration total of approximately 150,000. This leads to a quota assigned to Great Britain and Northern Ireland of approximately 65,800, and a quota for the Free State of Ireland of approximately 17,800, or combined figures of well over 83,000. This is approximately 55 percent of the annual quota total.

Mr. President, in the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator

from New York and other Senators, we are not proposing to change these quotas, but we are proposing to pool the unused surpluses. This is a matter of great importance, because in practice the British quota is two-thirds unused. I placed in the RECORD on Monday a tabulation of the number of people from various countries who had entered the United States since 1930, and even if we exclude the years of the depression and the war years, we do not ordinarily have more than 20,000 to 22,000 people from Great Britain and Northern Ireland entering the United States. Under the present law the surpluses of unused quota numbers are canceled and are not transferred.

Similarly in the case of the Irish Free State, during the past 4 years the average annual entrants have numbered between 6,000 and 7,000, leaving unused

quotas of from 10,000 to 11,000, which are canceled. Furthermore, because of the fact that people of a given nationality group are counted only according to their place of birth, the German quota has been undersubscribed despite the large migrant population in Germany seeking to emigrate. The result is that, because of the cancellation of the unused quotas, instead of admitting 150,000 each year, not more than from 90,000 to 100,000 people each year come into the United States under the quota system.

Now, while the quotas for Great Britain and Ireland are not used, in other countries there is a tremendous excess demand for these quotas. Let us take the case of Italy. In the period prior to World War I, the Italians who came into this country each year numbered approximately 200,000. Yet they are now given a quota of only 5,800. Under the

quota provisions of the present law, which would be continued by the McCarran bill, Italy, with a vast surplus population, finds it virtually impossible to send her people here. Poland, from which enormous numbers of nationals came to this country prior to World War I, has a quota of but 6,500. The Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have quotas of from 100 to 400. Hard-pressed Greece has a quota of but 310. In other words, the quotas are small for the countries which have surplus populations, and there is no doubt that the act of 1924 was rigged with that in mind. It was so rigged as to make it extremely difficult for persons from southern and eastern Europe to enter the United States.

The position of those of us who are seeking to secure approval of what we believe is a better bill is that the unused quotas should be pooled and then apportioned on some basis other than that of nationality. Perhaps I should point out that the difference between the short bill which has been offered as an amendment, and the long bill which was introduced by the same sponsors earlier in the session is that whereas the long bill would increase the total number of immigrants from 150,000 a year to approximately 250,000 a year, the short bill does not change the total number of 150,000. In the pending substitute we are merely proposing that the unused quotas shall be pooled and transferred on some basis other than that of nationality.

What then is to be the basis for distributing these unused quotas if it is not to be nationality? Twenty-five percent of the unused quotas are to be distributed on the basis of family reunion preferences, to grandparents, children, parents, other blood relatives, and so forth, so that families may be reunited in this country.

Twenty-five percent of the unused quotas are to be distributed on the basis of the need in this country for persons with a high degree of education, technical training, exceptional ability or specialized experience, persons who are urgently needed in the United States. Under this preference category, we may pick out, regardless of nationality, those persons who would be best adapted to the needs of the country.

Twenty-five percent are to be apportioned on a preferential basis to those who have been persecuted abroad or who have been driven from their native lands because of their adherence to democratic beliefs and opposition to dictatorship, or who have been classified as persecutees—people who are in great need.

Twenty-five percent are to be apportioned on the basis of special circumstances of hardship.

We submit that this is a much more humane manner of treatment and a greatly needed improvement in our immigration policy. The Nation can certainly absorb 150,000 immigrants a year. If Great Britain and Ireland do not use their quotas, they should not be canceled, but should be transferred on the basis which I have enumerated. In other words, Great Britain and Ireland would have first call, but they would not shut

off others from coming here who were especially qualified. That is one very essential feature of the Humphrey-Lehman substitute which is now before the Senate, and I think it is one that should commend itself to the American people and to Congress.

Mr. President, I now desire to mention another change which the Humphrey-Lehman substitute would bring about, namely, the compulsory application of the Administrative Procedure Act to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and to the section and officers of the Department of Justice who deal with individual immigration cases. I argued this point at length on Monday, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains a rather full statement of my position.

The fundamental purpose of the Administrative Procedure Act was to separate those who were acting in a judicial capacity from the investigative and prosecuting functions before the body of which they were members, so that the same man would not be in himself investigator, prosecutor, and judge. This was done on the ground that no man can be a proper or fair judge in a case in which he is a prosecutor or in which he has done investigative work.

Another purpose of the Administrative Procedure Act was to make judicial officers in administrative departments independent of the heads of those departments, so they could not be disciplined if they made a decision contrary to the wishes of the heads of such departments. So long as examiners can be demoted or transferred or denied increases in salary which otherwise would be theirs, so long as the head of a department can punish an examiner for his acts or withhold normal advancement, we cannot have a truly impartial tribunal inside an administrative agency. That has been a weakness in our system of military justice. The commanding officer can designate certain officers to serve on a court martial, and then the word may go out that the "Old Man" wants such and such a verdict. Of course the officers are reluctant to render an opinion contrary to the desires of their commanding officer. That has been a crucial, weak point in our system of military justice, and it has been a weak point in our system of administrative justice.

The purpose of the Administrative Procedure Act was to make the future of these men independent of the judgment of the heads of the departments or agencies in which they serve, so that their promotion and their salary rating would be fixed by the Civil Service Commission and not by the Attorney General or the head of the department in question.

It is because the McCarran bill does not contain these safeguards that those who are sponsoring the Lehman-Humphrey substitute feel that our measure, with its specific provision to make the Administrative Procedure Act applicable, is preferable.

Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD on Monday an analysis, which was fairly detailed in nature, of this very point. I pointed out that the special inquiry officer provided for under section 242 (b)

of S. 2550 conducts the proceedings, administers oaths, presents and receives evidence, examines and cross-examines witnesses, and thus has some prosecuting functions.

While it is said that he shall not be an investigator in the particular case upon which he passes, nevertheless he may be an investigator in other cases.

Senators will remember the so-called Sung case in which the Supreme Court declared to be improper the practice of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, where the hearing officer, while not investigating the case in question, was an investigator in other cases. The case thus ruled on a situation which would be permitted under S. 2550, in which inquiry officer A would investigate alien X and inquiry officer B would investigate alien Y, and then they would simply swap functions when they came to serve as judicial officers. The Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Jackson, said this was improper, and, in the absence of statutory authority, unconstitutional.

As I read the pending omnibus bill, S. 2550, it is proposed to make legal by statute the taking away from a man that which the Supreme Court said should not be taken away, namely, the right to a hearing before an officer who is not also an investigator or prosecutor. Similarly, the Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Jackson, emphasized the necessity for the examiner or judicial officer to be independent of the head of the bureau. Yet, Mr. President, the McCarran bill provides that the procedure so prescribed shall be the sole and exclusive procedure for determining the deportability of an alien under this section, and in any case in which an alien is ordered deported from the United States, under the provisions of the act, under law or treaty, the decision of the Attorney General shall be final.

The way is therefore left open under S. 2550 for the so-called special inquiry officer, who is really a hearing officer, to present evidence and to cross-examine, and, in effect, therefore, to prosecute in that very case. He is also free to investigate other cases and, hence, to develop the frame of mind of an investigator.

Furthermore, he is under the control of the Attorney General and the intermediate directors and commissioners. Independence is not given to him. The Attorney General and not the Civil Service Commission can discipline him, can promote or demote him, or change his salary so that he does not have the independence which a judge should have and which it was the purpose of the Administrative Procedure Act to require.

Mr. President, section 8 of the short Humphrey-Lehman bill provides that the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to all proceedings relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens. In this important respect also, therefore, it is far preferable to S. 2550. The Administrative Procedure Act was a splendid act which was passed by the Congress of the United States, and I want to congratulate the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]

for the very fine part which he played in the passage of that act. It was a milestone in administrative procedure. Why should it not apply to human beings as well as to the rights of corporations? Poor and humble persons deserve proper protection equally with the powerful.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute to thank the Senator from Nevada for the courtesy he has extended to the opponents of the pending bill by granting us additional time. I deeply appreciate his kindness.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is entirely welcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time of the proponents of the amendment in the nature of a substitute having expired, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a letter over the signature of Miles D. Kennedy, director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, dated May 21, 1952, and I ask that the clerk may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1952.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: I understand from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the amendment offered by Senator LEHMAN in the nature of a substitute for S. 2550 comes up for vote this afternoon.

As you have previously been advised by Mr. Donald R. Wilson, national commander for the American Legion, this organization has gone on record as supporting S. 2550. In view of this fact, I trust you will do everything possible to cause the defeat of Senator LEHMAN's proposed amendment.

If you care to do so, please feel free to read this communication into the RECORD during the course of the debate.

Thanking you for your courtesy, I am,
Sincerely yours,
MILES D. KENNEDY, Director.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some few days ago the proponents of the Humphrey-Lehman bill inserted in the RECORD a statement to the effect that the Humphrey-Lehman bill was being supported by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of Catholic Women, and the Catholic Rural Life Conference.

On Monday, May 19, I inserted in the RECORD a letter from the National Catholic Welfare Conference in which it is stated that neither the National Catholic Welfare Conference nor the National Council of Catholic Women have supported the Humphrey-Lehman bill, but do rather favor the McCarran-Walter bill.

I now ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a letter I have just received from the National Catholic Rural Life Conference signed by Rev. William J. Gibbons, S. J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC
RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,
Des Moines, Iowa, May 17, 1952.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: To avoid any possible misunderstanding, I would like to make clear that no individual, group, or conference body has been authorized to speak on behalf of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, in connection with current discussions on immigration law revision.

The views of our organization were presented formally in writing, with additional oral discussion, on two occasions: at the hearings of July 20, 1948, and again on March 12, 1951, when joint hearings were being held on S. 716 and H. R. 2379.

In March 1951 we also expressed our approval of the statement submitted by the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship, and joined with certain other organizations in signing a statement on particular points of immigration law. All these statements are a matter of record in the published hearings of the committees which considered the proposed legislation.

Apart from the above instances, when its views were expressed on its own behalf, the NCRLC has taken no official position publicly on these matters. Nor has it recognized use of its name in this connection by others.

Some supplementary observations were made privately in letters to the respective chairmen of the committees, prior to reporting of the bills by these committees.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM J. GIBBONS, S. J.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, and ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

Whereas in the closing days of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, there was introduced in the Senate, Senate bill 2343, sponsored by Senators LEHMAN, HUMPHREY, GILLETTE, IVES, KEFAUVER, and others, to effect certain basic changes in the present immigration and naturalization laws; and

Whereas a comparative analysis of the McCarran-Walter bill with the Lehman-Humphrey bill shows that the Lehman-Humphrey bill would, in effect, destroy our national origins quota system:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, support and urge the Congress to enact, at the earliest possible moment, the McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration and naturalization bill now pending in the Senate and House of Representatives, and that Congress reject the Lehman-Humphrey immigration bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the thirty-ninth annual congress of the National Society of New England Women, and ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
SUPPORT OF THE McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILL

Whereas the McCarran-Walter immigration and naturalization bill makes the fol-

lowing changes in our immigration laws: A system of selective immigration, within our quota system; fixed limitations so as to prevent an influx of orientals; more thorough screening, especially on security risks; enforcement agencies, exclusion and deportation procedures are strengthened and naturalization and denaturalization procedures are strengthened to weed out subversives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the thirty-ninth congress of the National Society of New England Women endorse the principles and urge the passage of Senate bill 2550 and House bill 5676, known as the McCarran-Walter bill, now on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram dated May 19, 1952, addressed to myself, and signed by Louis M. Killeen, of Phoenix, Ariz., and Vic Opez, of Glendale, Ariz., which reads as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., May 19, 1952.
The Honorable PAT McCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of the United Mexican-American Citizens' Social League of Arizona, we would like to endorse your sponsored S. 2550. We feel this legislation is needed and necessary improvement of our immigration and naturalization law. We are primarily interested in this bill since it will erase the present discrimination in naturalization. It will strengthen the security of our country by better screening of immigrants, and exclusion and deportation procedures are strengthened.

Regards.

LOUIS M. KILLEEN,
VIC OPEZ,

Member, City Council, Glendale, Ariz.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the adoption of the Humphrey-Lehman substitute would be disastrous to the United States of America. As I shall point out in more detail in the course of my remarks, the amendment would produce forthwith four consequences:

First. The opening of the gates to a flood of Asiatics. So fantastic is this provision of the amendment that it is unalterably opposed by all of the major oriental groups, which, incidentally, have endorsed the McCarran-Walter bill as a fair and reasonable solution of the problem of racial ineligibles;

Second. The destruction of the national origins quota system, which is the foundation upon which is built our protective immigration system;

Third. Increase substantially the number of aliens of all races who would be eligible for admission into the United States for permanent residence; and

Fourth. A shackling of the authorities who are charged with enforcement of the immigration and naturalization laws.

At this point I may say that although the amendment has been offered as a substitute for the committee bill, it does not purport to revise the immigration and nationality laws, as does the committee bill. It does not plug any loopholes in those laws; instead, it would tear huge gaps in them.

I may say, too, Mr. President, that the essence of the so-called substitute was embodied in S. 2343, which was introduced on October 20, 1951, and which was carefully considered and flatly rejected by the seven Senators who constitute the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and who, with

a staff of experts, worked on this legislation for over 3 years.

Let me point out also that the essence of the so-called substitute was proposed to the seven-man Subcommittee on Immigration of the House of Representatives, and, after careful consideration, was flatly rejected. The essence of the so-called substitute was also proposed in recent weeks to the House of Representatives, which rejected it by an overwhelming vote.

Furthermore, the various segments of this so-called substitute measure were each carefully explored in the exhaustive hearings of the joint congressional committee, but, strangely enough, not one of the sponsors of this so-called substitute measure spoke one word in behalf of the provisions of this amendment.

Mr. President, let me be specific with reference to the several provisions of this amendment.

First, I direct the attention of the Senate to the provisions of this amendment affecting orientals. The amendment would, in one sweep, wipe away all of the provisions of the present law relating to racial ineligibles, without substituting any reasonable limitation in their place. The result is five-fold. First, immediately other provisions of the law become operative for the establishment of quotas for each of several oriental countries; secondly, the provisions of existing law, which provide non-quota status for persons who are born in independent countries of the Western Hemisphere, become operative so that an estimated 600,000 orientals who are natives of nonquota countries of the Western Hemisphere would be immediately eligible for immigration to the United States for permanent residence; third, an estimated million and one-half orientals who are natives of quota countries of the world would be competing for the quotas assigned to the natives of those countries; fourth, under the quota-pooling provisions of the so-called substitute measure, the tremendous population of Asia would be competing with the smaller population of Europe for the pooled quotas; and, fifth, thousands upon thousands of orientals without statutory limitation would become immediately eligible for immigration to the United States for permanent residence because of the greatly expanded non-quota categories which would be established pursuant to the amendment.

Now, Mr. President, let me repeat what I said earlier in my remarks, that these provisions of the substitute bill are so fantastic, so drastic, and so unrealistic that the major oriental groups in the United States are unalterably opposed to the amendment, because they know it would give them the kiss of death. May I say right here that these major oriental groups have endorsed the McCarran-Walter bill without reservation. I have already placed in the RECORD, Mr. President, the resolutions on this subject from the Filipino Federation of America, Inc., by the Japanese-American Citizens League, and the Chinese-American Citizens Alliance.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a telegram which I have just re-

ceived from the four principal oriental groups in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the telegram.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 20, 1952.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building, Wash-
ington, D. C.:

Four national organizations representing 90 percent American citizens Asian ancestry strongly oppose substituting Humphrey-Lehman bill for McCarran omnibus bill. Humphrey-Lehman substitute ill-advised, impractical, and not in best interest persons of Asian ancestry.

We endorse unqualifiedly McCarran-Walter bill as fairest and most realistic possible approach to immigration and naturalization problems at this time. We, therefore, urge full support of McCarran-Walter bill and recommend defeat of any substitute bill or crippling amendments.

DR. RANDOLPH M. SAKADA,
National President, Japanese American
Citizens League.

Y. C. HONG,
Grand National President, Chinese
American Citizens Alliance.

Gen. HILARIO C. MONCADO,
Supreme Life President, Filipino
Federation of America.

CHIN HA CHOY,
General Manager, Korean National
Association.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me pause right here to point out again to the Senate just what the McCarran-Walter bill does with reference to the serious problem of aliens who are, under existing law, racially ineligible for admission into the United States. Under the McCarran-Walter bill, no one is inadmissible to the United States or ineligible to naturalization solely on the basis of race, but all persons of races indigenous to an area designated as the Asia-Pacific triangle are assigned to the quotas for that area. At the expense of being tedious on this very important issue, Mr. President, may I say again that this so-called substitute amendment which would allegedly liberalize those provisions of the immigration laws which contain racial limitations, are vigorously opposed by the very groups which they would allegedly benefit.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the provisions of this substitute amendment for the pooling of unused quotas. Mr. President, the pooling of unused quotas would be in direct conflict with the national origins quota principle which is the foundation of our protective immigration system and which seeks to maintain the relative composition of our population by assigning quotas to the various countries of the world on the basis of the percentage of the population of the United States of each nationality. The effect of pooling unused quotas would be not only to substantially increase the number of aliens coming to the United States for permanent residence, but would, in the course of a generation or so, change the ethnic and cultural composition of this Nation. Mr. President, let no one be misled by the statements made by the proponents of this substitute amendment with reference to the plan and purpose of the national origins quota system. The

quotas under the national-origins system, Mr. President, are ceilings, not floors, on the number of visas which may be issued. In other words, the law clearly contemplates that aliens who are to come to this country for permanent residence under the quotas shall come in proportion to the contribution of each nationality to the total population of the United States as it existed in 1920, which was the year of the last census immediately preceding the date of the establishment of the national-origins-quota formula.

Much has been said and is still being said about it being the duty of our country to open wider and wider the gates, in order to alleviate the surplus population of the overpopulated countries of the world. Mr. President, an immigration and nationality code is not the proper vehicle for the solution of the surplus population problems of the world. At the present time, there is pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration, Senate Resolution 270, which I submitted, to make an immediate study and investigation of the problems of surplus populations, of expellees, and of refugees. I have also introduced in the Senate, Senate bill 2567, to provide for the establishment of an agency of this Government to assist in the migration of surplus population of overpopulated areas to underdeveloped and underpopulated areas. I do not know, Mr. President, what the answer may be to this vital world problem; but I do know that the answer will not be found through the destruction of our own immigration system.

It has also been announced that in the very near future a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives will commence hearings on proposals to assist in solving the refugee problems which now exist in the countries of Western Europe. The question of what to do about the surplus population problem of many of the countries of Western Europe, is therefore, receiving active consideration; and I believe that it is exceedingly unwise to attempt to solve the refugee problem in permanent immigration legislation.

The proponents of this substitute amendment speak of the allocation of the unused quota numbers on the basis of family union preferences and national need preferences. Let me say, Mr. President, that under the committee bill, every reasonable provision is made to prevent the separation of families. Let me enumerate some of the provisions of the committee bill which have been carefully worked out to effect this objective:

First. A nonquota status is provided for an immigrant who is the child or the spouse of a citizen of the United States.

Second. A 30-percent preference under each quota is provided for aliens who are the parents of citizens of the United States.

Third. A 20-percent preference under each quota is provided for aliens who are the spouses or children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

Fourth. Twenty-five percent of any nonpreference portion of each quota is made available for aliens who are the

brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of citizens of the United States.

Fifth. Under the provision which allocates 50 percent of each quota for aliens who possess special skills or knowledge and whose services are needed in this country, there is also recognition of the policy of preventing the separation of families, because aliens who are the spouses or children of any such immigrant are also entitled to the preference if accompanying the preference-quota immigrant.

Sixth. Those provisions relating to the determination of the quota to which an immigrant is chargeable also contain provisions which permit an alien child accompanied by his alien parent or parents to be charged to the quota of either parent, in order to prevent the separation of the family unit, and which permit an alien chargeable to a different quota from that of his accompanying spouse to be charged to the quota of the accompanying spouse if necessary to prevent the separation of the family unit.

Seventh. Under the nonimmigrant categories of aliens, established for diplomats, semidiplomats, treaty traders, and bona fide representatives of foreign press, radio, film, or other foreign information media, provision is made for the entry of the members of the family of such aliens under the same nonimmigrant status.

Eighth. Under the provisions of the bill which grant nonquota status to certain natives of western hemisphere countries, to alien ministers, and to retired former employees of the United States Government abroad, the spouses and children of such aliens are permitted to enter under the same status, if accompanying or following to join the nonquota immigrant.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I prefer not to yield, for my time is limited. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will pardon me if I do not yield to him at this time.

Mr. LONG. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now invite the attention of the Senate to the provisions of the substitute amendment which would increase substantially the number of aliens of all races who would be eligible for admission into the United States for permanent residence. This is in addition to the increase of about 50,000 a year which would result from the pooling of quotas, and the increase of untold thousands which would result from the provisions of the substitute amendment which would enable orientals born in the Western Hemisphere to enter this country without numerical limitation.

The first new category of nonquota immigrants which the substitute amendment would establish embraces parents of citizens of the United States who, under the present law, are first preference under the quotas. The effect of making parents of citizens nonquota

would be, in many instances, to triple the number of aliens who would be admitted into the United States, because this provision would be operative principally with respect to the parents of naturalized citizens. In other words, under this provision, an alien would come to the United States; and as soon as he is naturalized, his parents would be admissible outside the quota limitations.

The second new category of nonquota immigrants which the substitute amendment would establish embraces untold numbers of children under 18 years of age who are separated from either or both parents and who meet certain vague standards prescribed in the amendment. Remember, Mr. President, this amendment would admit these children, without numerical limitation, from every corner of the globe.

The third new, nonquota category which would be established by the substitute amendment embraces all aliens who, at any time, anywhere, serve for even 1 day in any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States, and also includes their spouses and children. I say, Mr. President, that this provision would transfer from the Congress of the United States to the military the determination of the admissibility of untold thousands of aliens, over the course of the next several years.

The fourth new nonquota category which would be established by the substitute amendment embraces all spouses of citizens. The committee bill provides that all spouses of citizens shall be nonquota, but contains certain safeguarding provisions to avoid the use of this provision fraudulently for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States. Let me say in passing, Mr. President, for the enlightenment of the Senate with reference to the present law, that the existing statutes provide nonquota status for the wife of an American citizen, but that nonquota status for the husband of an American citizen is not granted, under the present law, unless the marriage took place prior to January 1, 1948.

Mr. President, I now direct the attention of the Senate to the provisions of the substitute amendment which would have the effect of shackling the officials who are charged with the enforcement of our immigration and naturalization laws.

The substitute amendment would, in one stroke, establish a statutory Board of Immigration Appeals, which would be independent from any supervision or control by the Department of Justice, and would transfer to that Board the powers and duties relating to appeals from decisions of Boards of Special Inquiry, conferred upon the Attorney General. In addition, the substitute amendment contains a sweeping provision that the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to all proceedings relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens.

Mr. President, at first blush these two provisions of the substitute amendment appear to be salutary and sound; in fact, the mind is charmed, at a first reading of these provisions, to believe that by just a few words of statutory language, chaos

is changed to order. But, Mr. President, anyone who has studied our immigration procedures and who is concerned with a vigorous and yet fair enforcement of the immigration laws is compelled to conclude that the provisions which I have just recited are intended to assure that we shall not, as a practical matter, exclude or deport any aliens from the United States.

Right here, Mr. President, let me say that I strongly favor the establishment of an administrative court of the United States which, within fixed limitations, would review actions by all administrative agencies of this Government. However, I emphasize that that review would be within fixed limitations, so that we would not have confusion confounded, as we would have under the substitute amendment, where a statutory board, whose power and jurisdiction would be virtually unlimited, would be administering and adjudicating at the same time, often in conflict with the Attorney General, who is the officer charged with the responsibility for the enforcement of the immigration laws. I have pending in the Senate at the present time, Mr. President, Senate bill 14, to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an administrative court of the United States. While I strongly advocate review of administrative determinations, this review must be within fixed limitations and must be set up on a sound basis. Otherwise we shall have chaos. I hope I do not appear immodest, Mr. President, when I say I know whereof I speak, because I was the principal author in the Senate of the Administrative Procedure Act to which I devoted intensive study and which I have closely observed in operation. At present, the Attorney General has created a Board of Immigration Appeals by administrative regulations which operates within fixed limitations to consider appeals from administrative decisions in those cases where a right of appeal to the Attorney General is provided under the law. The committee bill, S. 2550, does not disturb the present authority of the Attorney General to continue the existence of the Board of Immigration Appeals, nor does it require the continuance of a Board of Immigration Appeals. I say, Mr. President, that the question of the review of decisions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service had better not be the subject of impulsive tampering at this time.

Now, Mr. President, the substitute amendment contains a provision which would repeal the present exemption of exclusion and expulsion proceedings from certain of the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act and make the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to all proceedings relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens. The committee bill, likewise, repeals the present exemption of exclusion and expulsion proceedings from certain of the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, but the committee bill goes further by writing within the framework of the Administrative Procedure Act specific procedures which are specially

adapted to the exclusion and expulsion of aliens.

Mr. President, in view of the many misleading statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate to the effect that my bill, S. 2550, completely ignores the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, which I sponsored in the Senate and which I shall always support wholeheartedly, I should like to make a few remarks concerning the procedural aspects of S. 2550.

In the case of *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath* (339 U. S. 33), decided on February 20, 1950, the United States Supreme Court held that administrative hearings in deportation cases must conform to the procedural requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. The effect of that decision was to raise the question of the validity of many of the hearings in deportation proceedings in which the alien had not been deported. As a result, the Immigration and Naturalization Service had to adjust its procedures and regulations to comply with that decision.

It should have made the adjustment when the Administrative Procedure Act became effective; for the act clearly contained no exemption for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It was the contention of the Immigration and Naturalization Service at a very early date that administrative problems required special procedures in connection with deportation; and at one time, shortly after enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee worked out a bill, in cooperation with the General Counsel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, for the purpose of establishing necessary special procedures in this regard without granting any blanket exemption from the Administrative Procedure Act. That has always been the important thing in the mind of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

However, the Immigration and Naturalization Service decided it wanted to contest in the courts the applicability of the Administrative Procedure Act; and, therefore, the bill to provide special procedures was dropped. The contest with respect to the applicability of the Administrative Procedure Act in deportation cases came to a head in the *Sung* case.

Following the *Sung* decision, the Department of Justice told Congress it would need an additional \$4,000,000 to meet the cost of complying with the Administrative Procedure Act. The facts show that this was a gross overestimate, but it was a persuasive argument to the House Appropriations Committee. In the course of the presentation of its case, before the House committee, the Department pointed out that in the majority of deportation cases the issue is simply whether or not the alien entered with proper documents or whether the alien overstayed his period of temporary admission, and that the facts are generally uncontested. In such cases, it was pointed out that the dual-examiner system would hamper effective administration without any

compensating advantage. The Department explained in some detail that under its deportation procedures, each alien is given notice of the charges against him and full opportunity to meet those charges, and that in all respects he is provided a full and fair hearing.

On the basis of the case presented by the Department of Justice, the House approved an appropriations bill rider which provided that "proceedings under law relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens shall hereafter be without regard to the provisions of sections 5, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act." Having been approved by the House, this rider was not subject to a point of order in the Senate; and eventually it became part of Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress. Thus, at the present time, the deportation procedures of the Immigration and Naturalization Service are completely exempted from the procedural requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Under the provisions of section 242 of Senate bill 2550, this exemption is terminated. The procedural requirements to be followed in the conduct of deportation cases are set out in detail. Except for the failure to comply strictly with the dual-examiner provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, I believe that the procedures set forth are in substantial compliance with the procedural rationale of the Administrative Procedure Act. I further believe that it has been demonstrated that it would be impracticable to adapt the dual-examiner system to the deportation procedures and that the special procedures provided in this bill are not inconsistent with section 7 of the Administrative Procedure Act which specifically exempts from the dual-examiner requirement specified classes, of proceedings before officers specially provided for by, or designated pursuant to, statute.

Let me stress this point, Mr. President: My consistent effort has always been to avoid or eliminate any and all blanket exemptions from the Administrative Procedure Act. This bill eliminates such an exemption in the case of deportation proceedings, but accomplishes such elimination with due regard for the administrative problems of the Immigration and Naturalization Service by providing at the same time the special procedures which these problems require. An important point here is that the Congress is providing these procedures. Under a blanket exemption, the agency would prescribe its own procedures.

Mr. President, in this debate, both on the substitute amendment and on the committee bill, I sense that the sponsors of the committee bill are at a decided disadvantage because the subject matter which they are dealing with is exceedingly technical and highly complicated and, therefore, it is difficult for us to answer sweeping general statements without explaining in some detail the intricacies of a bill which is a result of thousands and thousands of hours of tedious work in which we were constantly advised by numerous experts in and out of the Government. The com-

mittee bill comes to the Senate from a duly-authorized committee which, together with the experts, have produced a bill which they believe to be sound and in the best interests of this country. The substitute amendment, as I have pointed out, would tear asunder policies which have been basic in our immigration system for generations. This substitute bill, Mr. President, is dangerous. It could only bring disaster to this Nation. I plead with the Senate to reject it.

During the delivery of Mr. McCARRAN's speech,

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request without jeopardizing his right to the floor?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield, but I should like to have this discussion follow my remarks.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that after the vote upon the substitute there be a limitation of debate upon amendments or amendments in the nature of substitutes, as follows:

For eight amendments, to be selected by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, 1 hour to each side, and for any additional amendments, 10 minutes to each side, the time to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Nevada; that the time for debate on any amendment to an amendment, or upon any appeal or motion, be limited to 10 minutes on a side, the time to be controlled in the same manner; that all amendments must be germane, and that the debate upon the bill be limited to 1 hour on each side, the time to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator include in the unanimous-consent agreement the provision that at the conclusion of the vote upon the substitute today a recess be taken until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is not necessary to include that provision in the unanimous-consent agreement. Some Senators may wish to make speeches after 4:30. If the Senator will accept my word on that subject, it will not be necessary to include such a provision in the unanimous-consent agreement.

I also ask that the limitation shall not begin until tomorrow, after Members of the Senate return from the joint meeting of the two Houses.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is there to be a joint meeting tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. General Ridgway will address Members of the Senate and of the House in a joint meeting tomorrow. Immediately after Senators return to the Senate Chamber, the limitation of debate will begin.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. At one point in the suggested agreement I think the Senator from Arizona used the term "substitute." I think he meant "amendment."

Mr. McFARLAND. I meant an amendment, or amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is there likely to be another amendment in the nature of a substitute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no such intention, let me say to the Senator from Nevada. It is only a matter of drafting a unanimous-consent agreement on which all parties can agree.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I have no idea that I shall object—there are certain amendments among the one-hundred-and-fifty-odd amendments submitted by the opponents of the bill which my staff and the staffs of Senators who are offering the amendments have gone over. We are prepared to accept about 20 of them and take them to conference, with the promise that we shall get out of them everything that is worthy of being included in the bill, in keeping with the policy of the bill. Such amendments, as I have said, number about 20. As I understand, they will not enter into the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. It will not take long to dispose of those amendments. They can be accepted. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement relates to a limitation of debate. I am very hopeful that it will not require an hour to a side for each of the amendments. I hope they can be disposed of more rapidly. I hope that we can complete consideration of the bill tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. As to the 20 amendments to which I have referred, which have been gone over by the staffs of the respective sides, they can be offered en bloc, if that is agreeable.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. That can be done.

Mr. McCARRAN. They will be accepted by the chairman of the committee and taken to conference.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. Are there eight amendments in addition to those?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it has been suggested that the amendments with respect to which the major portion of time is allotted, that is, an hour to a side, be taken up first, and that the amendments to which the Senator from Nevada is now referring could come up under the 10-minute rule. I think it is entirely probable that we can present them, if not in one block, at least in two or three packages, in order that they may be properly explained and agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not want to have any misunderstanding on the part of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee with regard to the possibility of presenting an amendment in the nature of a substitute. There is one amendment which is in the nature of a substitute, which we may wish to offer.

I wish to make that clear, so that there may be no misunderstanding.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am trying to deal with the Senator from Minnesota in this matter. I have been dealing with him all morning. I have been trying to be as agreeable as possible. But if we are to be confronted with substitute after substitute we may as well abandon the effort to reach a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. It would not require any longer to dispose of a substitute under this agreement than to dispose of any other amendment. In other words, there would be the same limitation with respect to the substitute, whatever it might be called.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not troubled so much on that score as I am about knowing the contents of substitutes. Substitutes are usually more voluminous than simple amendments, and it is more difficult to analyze them and find out what they propose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us be candid. There are no secrets. The amendment to which the Senator from New York refers is one which pertains to the question of discrimination on the basis of sex, and discrimination on the basis of race. That is one amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is not long.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is an amendment which is on the desk. It is one of the amendments which we would undoubtedly have called up, but it is in the nature of a substitute. I believe that all we have to do is to treat each other in good faith, and a unanimous-consent agreement can be arrived at.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection on that score. However, I do not wish to be compelled to study a voluminous substitute within an hour or so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can assure the Senator that there will be no voluminous substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I hear the nature of the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will state to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that it is the same as the request which was previously presented. The Senator from Oregon wanted some time to study it. I understood that it had been cleared with him.

Senators wanted to have the time until noon tomorrow to study the amendments. I had previously announced that the session would begin at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, but I understand that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and other Senators associated with him have some amendments to which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] will agree. The Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Minnesota and his colleagues will decide which amendments can be agreed upon. It was desired that they should have time tomorrow to work on the amendments. There will be no further votes this afternoon, after 4:30. Senators want the time after 4:30 this afternoon and the time during the morning, to study the amendments.

When the Senate reconvenes tomorrow after the joint meeting, which will

be addressed by General Ridgway, the debate will be limited to 1 hour to a side on the first eight amendments, and thereafter to 10 minutes to a side, all amendments to be germane, the time to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] or the proponent of the amendment, and the distinguished Senator from Nevada, on the other side, in the event he is not in favor of the amendment; and, if he is in favor of it, then by the minority leader or any Senator he may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand that there is to be 1 hour on each amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. One hour to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On each amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. On each of the first eight amendments, the eight amendments to be selected by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wonder whether 1 hour, divided equally, would not be sufficient on each of the eight amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would prefer that we leave it at an hour to each side. Perhaps there will be some amendments on which we will not want to take all the time allowed. On other amendments we will need all the time. Therefore I would suggest that we leave the agreement as now proposed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as I hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the agreement in any way exclude motions?

Mr. McFARLAND. I included motions in the unanimous-consent request. I did not include them when I was discussing the request with the Senator from Oregon. Motions are included.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the discussion of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement not be deducted from the time allowed to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. A vote is to be taken at 4:30, and I shall meet that deadline.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—may I ask whether the majority leader contemplates holding a night session tomorrow night, as heretofore announced, and a morning session beginning at 10 o'clock commencing Friday morning?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think that Senators should hold themselves in readiness for a night session tomorrow night. I hope we shall be able to finish consideration of the bill tomorrow. If it begins to look as though we will have to sit very late, or that we cannot finish consideration of the bill tomorrow night,

we may convene early on Friday. However, announcement with respect to that point will be made tomorrow when we convene.

Mr. WELKER. I wish merely to observe that we may run into 16 hours of work. I am sure that the majority leader will not insist upon that unless it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct; unless it is absolutely necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

The agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That beginning on Thursday, May 22, 1952, after the return of the Senate from the joint meeting of the two Houses at 12:30 p. m., further debate upon amendments or substitutes to the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, including motions and appeals, shall be limited as follows:

(1) On eight amendments, to be presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, and to be first considered, 1 hour to each side, the time of the proponents to be controlled by Mr. HUMPHREY and of the opponents by Mr. McCARRAN.

(2) That upon any other amendment (including motions or appeals) 10 minutes to each side, to be controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. McCARRAN in the event he is opposed to such an amendment or motion; otherwise by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received; and

(3) Debate upon the question of the passage of the bill shall be limited to 1 hour to the side, to be controlled by Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. McCARRAN, respectively.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, is there a limitation of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is until 4:30, when the Senate will proceed to a vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say to the Senator from Nevada that I desire to say a few words in support of the substitute bill. I understand that the time allotted for debate to the proponents of the substitute bill has been exhausted.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield time to the Senator from Wyoming out of my own time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind. I do not intend to take a great deal of time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator tell me how much time he wants?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not believe I shall speak more than 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield that much time to the Senator from Wyoming.

THE IMMIGRANT HAS BUILT AMERICA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have long been deeply concerned about the problem of immigration and the fears so many people seem to entertain that peoples from some countries of Europe will not make good Americans. This fear is entertained in the face of evidence daily before our eyes that they make good citizens, in the face of the historic fact that many of the philosophical and cultural principles of which we are most

proud, to say nothing of our religious beliefs, have come to us from the very races we now seem loath to allow to gaze upon the words inscribed on the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,

I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

I think we stand in danger of surrendering to baseless fears at a time when we can advance the cause of humanity most by a more liberal attitude toward the unfortunate peoples of Europe who, like our own ancestors, seek only freedom and opportunity.

In certain portions of my State there are counties, citizens of which have been recruited from almost every country in Europe and from many nations in the New World as well. I am thinking particularly of Sweetwater County, Wyo., the population of which probably is made up of a greater variety of nationalities than any other county in the United States, not excepting New York, or Manhattan, in the city of New York.

Sweetwater County is a coal-mining area. Working in the mines of Sweetwater County there are to be found persons from almost every country and almost every race—Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Italians, Albanians, Austrians, Armenians, Basques, Chinese, Czechoslovakians, Danes, Finns, French, Germans, Greeks, Hebrews, Hungarians, Yugoslavs, Lithuanians, Japanese, Norwegians, Mexicans, Poles, Negroes, Rumanians, Russians, Spaniards, Swedes, Turks, Dutchmen, Irishmen, Englishmen, Scots, and Welsh. I am proud to be personally acquainted with many of them and to have visited them in their homes.

I can say without any hesitation that I know of no community in the entire United States, and I have visited many, in which there is a higher standard of intellectual ability, integrity, and of Americanism than is to be found in that county in Wyoming. I could say the same for many other areas in my State, as well as for many similar areas in other States of the Union which I have visited.

One of my problems almost daily is to deal with the sad difficulties which arise when American citizens find it impossible to bring into the United States their relatives from abroad. They cannot come in under the present law because of the quota limitation—a limitation which stands between them and happiness here. It is my recollection that the present law imposes a limitation of 308 on the number of Greeks who may come into the United States each year, and a limitation of 5,645 on Italians. Greeks and Italians are among our best and most progressive people.

Mr. President, we are depriving ourselves of the opportunity of having come to our shores competent, able men and women who would make patriotic citizens and who are seeking to escape the restrictions of Europe to contribute their talents and skills to this land of freedom in order to enjoy the liberty of which we boast. We have erected a terrible iron

curtain against these people. We seem to fear to permit them to enter the United States. I cannot understand how such a fear can possibly arise. I think the proposal in the substitute bill, which would permit the allocation of unused quotas from the northern nations of Europe to the southern nations of Europe would be a great blessing to the United States.

I say I am unable to understand the fear which seems to make us tremble at the thought that people of the same strains which have already achieved success here will somehow damage us. Ninety-nine percent of those who would come into this country are seeking only an opportunity to prosper and to promote economic and political liberty in the United States.

Day after day we pick up the newspapers and read accounts of sports events. How is it possible for any person who is interested in baseball or football to be afraid of people from areas upon which we impose these rigid restrictions on immigration? I do not know what the Irish teams of Notre Dame would do without Poles, Italians, Slovenians, and all the rest. I do not know what the record of Notre Dame would be in football without them. Yet we seem to be afraid to grant a little greater liberality in admitting these people.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Has it ever occurred to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming what the United States would have done about building an army of 11,000,000 in World War II if it had not been for the sons of the very people who have overnight become so obnoxious to us?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Why, of course. The Senator from Rhode Island comes from a State in which there is a very large admixture of nationalities from all over Europe. He comes from a great State, where the people stand upon an equal level with citizens of every other State.

As I was saying, it seems to me that we just cannot read the box scores in the newspapers without realizing how absurd it is to be afraid of immigration. The United States was built upon immigration.

Just a moment ago I picked up the New York Times and checked through the sports section to see what terrible mistakes we must have made in the past. Chicago and Brooklyn played a baseball game last Sunday. On the Chicago team I find the names Miksis, Hermanski, Pramesa, Ramazzotti. On the Brooklyn team, Pafko. The umpire was Guglielmo. What strange aberration that we have permitted these men or their fathers to come into the United States? Is it not fantastic that we fear more of the same?

I read the list of batting averages of the Dodgers, the Giants, and the Yankees. This table appeared in the New York Times of Monday, May 19. Here are some of the names of the Dodgers: Abrams, Campanella, Furillo, Shuba, Podbielan, and Schmitz.

On the Giants I find Maglie, Jansen, Bamberger, Yvars, and Koslo.

On the Yankees there are Silvera, Lopat, Kuzava, Cerv, Berra, Rizzuto.

What sort of man is this Rizzuto? Where did he come from? How was he able to get in or squeeze in under the curtain? How did he or his father or his grandfather get in? What penalty falls upon the rest of us that these men can compete upon the baseball field?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I was very much interested in the list of names the distinguished Senator from Wyoming read. I wonder whether he would not agree that if he read the list of casualties in Korea, he would find substantially the same kind of names.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, of course that is true. When I was arguing upon the floor in behalf of statehood for Hawaii, I read the list of casualties among Hawaiian soldiers who fought in Korea and who fought in Italy. Certainly the casualties included the names of Japanese and Hawaiians. Throughout World War I and World War II we were proud of our soldiers who came to America from foreign countries, or whose fathers did.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator will not agree with me that the development of our aircraft industry, particularly with respect to war planes, would have been greatly retarded, if not completely interfered with, if it had not been for men like deSeversky, Sikorsky, and Bellanca; and that our atom bomb development would have been greatly retarded, if not completely stopped, if it had not been for persons like Einstein and Fermi, who came to the United States to help us in the development of planes, atom bombs, and other great weapons of defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is so correct.

Mr. President, when I learned that I was going to have a few minutes to speak upon this matter, I asked one of the most efficient members of my staff, Mike Manatos, whose parents came from Crete, to jot down the names of some athletes of south European origin, names that might not have come so readily to my mind.

The name of Joe DiMaggio is at the top. Like many another Senator I have been on Joe DiMaggio's father's fish pier in San Francisco. I saw no lack of Americanism there.

Eddie Arcaro. How many rugged Americans of Scandinavian blood, Irish blood, or British blood, living in States which permit racing and betting, have placed their bets upon a horse race because Eddie Arcaro was up?

Here is Guy Lombardo, the orchestra leader.

Tony Canzoneri, a boxer.

There is Gene Sarazen, in golf.

What could have been the matter with our parents that such persons were permitted to come in? Why do we not exclude them all?

Only 308 Greeks and 5,000 Italians may come in next year. If the British, French, Spanish, Welsh, and Irish do not care to come, I should be very glad to have some of the Greeks, Italians, Austrians, Hungarians, and the others in their place. When we think of people whom we know who have come from Italy and Greece, I believe we would all be willing to do the same thing.

Back now to the list. Joe Savoldi made his name at Notre Dame on the Irish team. So did Frank Carrideo, who was a quarterback for the Irish under Knute Rockne, and Tom Kassis, of Cheyenne, who played a star game in the line for the great coach. Is not this exclusion phobia a little fantastic?

Here are the names of Sam Mele, Vic Raschi, Charles Fusari, Tony Janiro.

So we could go down the list. I have cited these names merely to make it clear that none need be afraid of any of them. These people are Americans. They are real Americans.

There are people who were unfortunate enough not to be able to come and who are now held behind the iron curtain of the narrow immigration law passed years ago over the veto of a great Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson. This law is depriving us of blood we need, of brains and brawn we need in this country, to help carry the great burden of the leadership of the world in the fight for the maintenance of civilization.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before the Senator concludes—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nevada, who controls the time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I speak only at his mercy, so I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inform the Senator that he has 20 minutes before the Senate votes on this matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum as soon as the Senator from Wyoming concludes, but I desire to draw the Senator's attention to the fact that all South American countries are nonquota. There are no quotas for South American countries.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I understand that, but I am now talking about Greeks and Italians and other European peoples. I said there were people from Latin-American countries who are in the County of Sweetwater, but I did not mean by that to say they were barred under existing law. As I say, I was talking about Greeks, Italians, and other Europeans.

Here are more names of successful Greek athletes: George Zaharias, Jim Londos, Gus Niarhos, and several others I could mention. What wears me down day after day in my office are the appeals which come from families which are broken because our immigration law is so rigid. The aged aunt, or the niece of a Greek family which is successfully engaged in business in the United States and which has eagerly assumed American citizenship, cannot enter our borders because of the quota limitation. Applications are piling high. Why should we not make the proposed change?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator knows, of course, that under the terms of the substitute which is now before the Senate there would be a pooling of the unused quotas, which would make available the opportunity to whom he refers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is why I am supporting it. I believe that provision for such pooling should be made, so that more people in the categories I have in mind may be permitted to come into the United States. I shall, with a great deal of pleasure and complete conviction that it is in the interest of the United States, vote for the substitute.

Mr. President, I am very much indebted to the Senator from Nevada for permitting me to occupy some of his time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	Monroney
Anderson	Hendrickson	Moody
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Benton	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Murray
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kem	Smathers
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Long	Sparkman
Dworshak	Malone	Stennis
Eastland	Maybank	Taft
Ellender	McCarran	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Underwood
Fulbright	McFarland	Watkins
George	McKellar	Welker
Gillette	McMahon	Williams
Green	Millikin	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. LEHMAN and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request for a yea-and-nay vote is sufficiently seconded. The Secretary will call the roll. Senators who favor the substitute will, when their names are called, vote "yea"; Senators who are opposed to the substitute will vote "nay" when their names are called. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

I announce further that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Sena-

tor from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—27

Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Benton	Hunt	Neely
Chavez	Ives	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kilgore	Pastore
Duff	Lehman	Saltonstall
Gillette	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Green	McMahon	Sparkman
Hendrickson	Moody	Tobey
Hennings	Morse	Underwood

NAYS—51

Aiken	Fulbright	McKellar
Bennett	George	Millikin
Bricker	Hayden	Monroney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hoey	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Robertson
Eyrd	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kem	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Long	Stennis
Cordon	Malone	Taft
Dworshak	Maybank	Thye
Eastland	McCarran	Watkins
Eliender	McCarthy	Welker
Ferguson	McClellan	Williams
Frear	McFarland	Young

NOT VOTING—18

Brewster	Hill	Magnuson
Cain	Jenner	Martin
Carlson	Kefauver	Nixon
Dirksen	Kerr	Russell
Ecton	Knowland	Seaton
Flanders	Langer	Wiley

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by Mr. LEHMAN, on behalf of himself and other Senators, was rejected.

The amendment on which the above vote was taken is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"REMOVAL OF RACIAL DISQUALIFICATION FOR NATURALIZATION AND FOR ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES

"SECTION 1. (a) No person shall be denied the right to become a citizen of the United States or the privilege to enter the United States as an immigrant solely on the ground of his race, nor shall any applicant for admission be assigned to a quota solely on the basis of his race.

"(b) The following laws are hereby repealed:

"(1) The twenty-seventh clause of the first sentence of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, and the second sentence of such section (8 U. S. C., sec. 136 (n));

"(2) Section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U. S. C., sec. 703);

"(3) Section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes,' approved December 17, 1943 (8 U. S. C., sec. 212a); and

"(4) Sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, and persons of races indigenous to the Philippine Islands, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes,' approved July 2, 1946 (8 U. S. C., sec. 212b and 212c).

"POOLED QUOTAS

"SEC. 2. Section 11 (f) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (8 U. S. C., sec. 211 (f)) (relating to limitations upon issuance of visas to quota immigrants) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, there shall be issued to quota immigrants of any nationality (A) no more immigration visas in any fiscal year than the quota for such nationality, and (B) in any quarter of any fiscal year no more immigration visas than 30 percent of the quota for such nationality.

"(2) All quota immigration visas available during any fiscal year which are not actually issued during such fiscal year, and all quota immigration visas which were issued in such fiscal year or in a previous year and expired during such fiscal year without being utilized, shall be assigned to a general immigration visa pool and shall be available, without reference to national origins, for issuance at any time during the fiscal year following such assignment as follows:

"(A) Family reunion preferences: 25 percent of such pooled visas, or such smaller percentage as shall be found by the Secretary of State to be sufficient properly to care for pending applications, shall be available exclusively, in such order as may be determined by the Secretary of State, to adult children, brothers and sisters, and other blood relatives (within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law) of citizens, and to spouses, children (both infant and adult), parents, brothers and sisters, and other blood relatives (within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law) of alien residents of the United States who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"(B) National need preferences: 25 percent of such pooled visas, or such smaller percentage as shall be found by the Secretary of State to be sufficient properly to care for pending applications, shall be available exclusively for persons who because of their high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability, are urgently needed in the United States (so far as such needs have not been met within the original quotas), or are likely to be of special benefit to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States as determined by the Secretary of State, on the basis of recommendations made by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor, or by such advisory committees, representing industry and labor, as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor may establish.

"(C) Persecutee preferences: 25 percent of such pooled visas, or such smaller percentages as shall be considered by the Secretary of State to be sufficient properly to care for pending applications, shall be available exclusively, in such order as may be determined by the Secretary of State, to persons (including persons temporarily within the jurisdiction of the United States) who have been persecuted abroad in the country of their national origin or in the place of their last residence on religious or racial grounds or because of their adherence to democratic beliefs or because of their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship, or who have reason to fear such persecution, and who have been classified as "persecutees" or "possible persecutees" in accordance with such procedures and after such investigations as the Secretary of State shall order.

"(D) Nonpreference cases: All pooled visas not required for issuance under the foregoing preferences shall be available, on application to the Secretary of State by an American citizen or a reputable American organization, to other immigrants, whose cases because of special circumstances or hardship

merit special consideration, in the order of their registration.'

"BOARD OF IMMIGRATION APPEALS

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Board of Immigration Appeals which shall be composed of three members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board shall be a part of the Department of Justice but, except for administrative purposes, shall not be subject to the supervision or control of any officer or employee of the Department. The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one member to serve as Chairman. Each member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 6 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, except that, of the members first taking office, one shall be appointed for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 6 years. Members of the Board shall receive compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

"(b) The powers and duties relating to appeals from decisions of Boards of Special Inquiry conferred upon the Attorney General by section 17 of the Immigration Act of 1917 are hereby transferred to the Board.

"(c) A quorum of the Board shall consist of two members. The Board may appoint and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems necessary.

"(d) The Board shall have authority to promulgate rules of practice governing the proceedings before it. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to all proceedings of the Board.

"NONQUOTA IMMIGRANTS: PARENTS; ORPHANS; MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

"SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (8 U. S. C., sec. 204) (relating to the definition of nonquota immigrant) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(g) An immigrant who is the parent of a citizen of the United States;

"(h) An immigrant who—

"(1) is a child under 18 years of age and, except for the provisions of the twenty-sixth clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 875; 8 U. S. C., sec. 136 (m)), is otherwise qualified under the immigration laws for admission into the United States for permanent residence; and

"(2) (A) has been made an orphan by the death or disappearance of both parents, or

"(B) has been abandoned or deserted by, or separated or lost from, both parents, or

"(C) has only one parent due to the death or disappearance, or abandonment or desertion by, or separation from the other parent and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for such child and agrees to release him for emigration and adoption; and

"(3) (A) is entering the United States for permanent residence with a father or mother by adoption, or

"(B) is entering the United States for permanent residence with a near relative or with a person who is a citizen of the United States or an alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or is coming to the United States to a public or private agency approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, and such relative, person, or agency gives assurances, satisfactory to the Commissioner, that adoption or guardianship proceedings will be initiated with respect to such child; and

"(4) with respect to whom assurances, satisfactory to the Commissioner, are given that such immigrant shall be properly cared for;

"(1) An immigrant who is serving or has served honorably in any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States, and his spouse and his children under 21 years of age.'

"PREFERENCE CATEGORIES

"SEC. 5. Immigrants who are the brothers, sisters, or adult children of citizens of the United States or who are the fathers or mothers of alien residents of the United States who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, shall be included in that category of immigrants granted a preference for the issuance of quota immigration visas within the terms of section 6 (a) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (8 U. S. C., sec. 206 (a) (2)).

"REMOVAL OF SEX DISCRIMINATIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Immigration Act of 1917, the Immigration Act of 1924, and all other immigration laws are hereby amended by striking out the words 'wife' and 'husband' and the words 'wives' and 'husbands' wherever they appear therein and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'spouse' and 'spouses', respectively.

"(b) The proviso in section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (8 U. S. C., sec. 204 (a)) is amended to read as follows: 'Provided, That the marriage shall have occurred prior to the issuance of the visa.'

"REFORMED MEMBERS OF PROSCRIBED ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 7. The first section of the act of October 16, 1918, (8 U. S. C., sec. 137) is amended—

"(a) by inserting after 'That' the following: '(a) except as provided in subsection (b)'; and

"(b) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Any alien who is within the classes described in subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), and (H) of paragraph (2) of subsection (a) solely because of past membership in or past affiliation with a party or organization or a section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision thereof, may be issued a visa if such alien establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer when applying for a visa and the consular officer finds that (1) such past membership or past affiliation was involuntary or occurred and terminated prior to the attainment by such alien of the age of 16 years, or (2) (A) such alien is and has been, for at least 2 years prior to the date of the application for a visa, actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles, and ideology of such party or organization or the section, subsidiary, branch, or affiliate or subdivision thereof, and (B) the consular officer finds that the admission of such alien into the United States would not be against the public interest. Any such alien to whom a visa has been issued under the provisions of this subsection may be admitted into the United States if he shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General when applying for admission to the United States and the Attorney General finds that (1) such past membership or past affiliation was involuntary or occurred and terminated prior to the attainment by such alien of the age of 16 years, or (2) (A) such alien is and has been, for at least 2 years prior to the date of the application for admission, actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles, and ideology of such party or organization or the section, subsidiary, branch, or affiliate or subdivision thereof, and (B) the Attorney General finds that the admission of such alien into the United States would not be against the public interest. The Attorney General shall promptly make a detailed report to the Congress in the case of each such alien who is or shall be admitted into the United States.'

"APPLICABILITY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

"SEC. 8. The paragraph headed 'General provisions—Department of Justice' in chapter III of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is repealed. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be ap-

plicable to all proceedings relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens. Nothing contained in this section shall invalidate, or require any change in, any proceedings which were commenced prior to the date of enactment of this act, or to invalidate any action taken before or after such date in connection with any such proceedings."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the immigration laws so as to eliminate discrimination based on race and sex; to provide for the use of unused immigration quotas; to provide nonquota status for parents of citizens, orphans, and alien members and former members of the Armed Forces; and for other purposes."

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into this afternoon, it was understood that there would be no more votes upon the pending bill, either this afternoon or tomorrow until after the Senate reconvenes following the joint meeting with the House which had been previously announced. That understanding was reached in order to afford time to the distinguished Senator from Nevada and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to confer concerning certain amendments which the Senator from Nevada indicated he would accept.

Shortly after the Senate meets tomorrow, it will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives, where a joint session of the two Houses will be addressed by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

The unanimous-consent agreement provides:

That beginning on Thursday, May 22, 1952, after the return of the Senate from the joint meeting of the two Houses, at 12:30 p. m., further debate upon amendments or substitutes to the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, including motions and appeals, shall be limited as follows:

(1) On eight amendments, to be presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, and to be first considered, 1 hour to each side, the time of the proponents to be controlled by Mr. HUMPHREY and of the opponents by Mr. McCARRAN.

The unanimous-consent agreement further provides that upon any other amendment, debate shall be limited to 10 minutes to each side; and that debate upon the question of the passage of the bill shall be limited to 1 hour to a side.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that all the time permitted under the agreement will not be consumed, that we may tomorrow finish this bill, and that on Friday we shall be able to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3086, Calendar No. 1505, a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes. After we shall have concluded the consideration of that bill, we shall probably take up Senate bill 3066, Calendar No. 1510, which is a bill to amend the defense housing laws, and for other purposes, provided, of course, that an appropriation bill is not at that time ready for consideration. Tomorrow, in the event the pending bill is disposed of

and the consideration of the mutual-security bill is begun, we shall then determine how much progress can be made and how soon that bill can be disposed of, after which I shall make a further announcement in regard to the program.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is the Senate to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, in order to expedite matters?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; the Senate will meet at 12 o'clock noon, since Senators on both sides of the pending measure desired to avail themselves of the time tomorrow morning to confer about certain amendments, which it is thought may be agreed to without controversy.

Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation for the cooperation of Senators who are interested in the pending bill in helping to reach a unanimous-consent agreement on the bill. I hope that Senators will be able to be on the floor tomorrow, because there will be a number of votes taken. As stated, the Senate will meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- S. 762. An act for the relief of Alexander Urszu;
- S. 997. An act for the relief of Paula Slucka (Slucki) and Ariel Slucki;
- S. 1372. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madeline Viale Moore; and
- S. 1679. An act for the relief of Stephen Gorove.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi;
- H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of Ethel White, Frankie Ezell, and Ralph James;
- H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen;
- H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of Margaret Frankel;
- H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of James Nels Ekberg;
- H. R. 2840. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck;
- H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa;
- H. R. 3334. An act for the relief of Paul Busbey;
- H. R. 3564. An act for the relief of Reuben Krakovsky;
- H. R. 3858. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon;
- H. R. 4126. An act for the relief of Ernst Sbaschnik, Sr.;
- H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;
- H. R. 4504. An act for the relief of Dr. Phillip Bloemsma and Mrs. Joy Roelink Bloemsma;
- H. R. 4543. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla Crowley;
- H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Mark Yen Hui;
- H. R. 5107. An act for the relief of Mar-
garite Mary Fujita;

H. R. 5108. An act for the relief of Nicola Lucia, and Rocco Fierro;

H. R. 5301. An act for the relief of Leonard Jesse Richards (Michio Inoue);

H. R. 5325. An act for the relief of S. Irby Adams;

H. R. 5864. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi;

H. R. 6010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lennie G. Clarkson and William E. Clarkson;

H. R. 6016. An act for the relief of Louis A. Schafer;

H. R. 6109. An act for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz;

H. R. 6505. An act for the relief of Karen Ann Crowley;

H. R. 6850. An act for the relief of Martha Bridges;

H. R. 6870. An act for the relief of Louie Bon Kong;

H. R. 6945. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoffmann;

H. R. 7860. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 454. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 897) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thanos Mellos, Michel Mellos, and Hermine Fahl, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SUSIE LEE SPENCER—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 131)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1045 "for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer."

This enactment proposes payment of \$7,500 to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., a Federal employee who was killed in 1943 during the course of her employment. Death resulted from the negligence of a fellow employee. The claim of her husband for death compensation under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act was denied upon the ground that he was not wholly dependent upon her for support at the time of death.

This enrollment is substantially the same as H. R. 1026, of the Eighty-first Congress, which I returned to the Congress without my approval. In principle, it is also the same as H. R. 1481 of that Congress, a bill "for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni," which I disapproved on May 3, 1950.

In declining to concur in these enactments, I indicated my belief that bills providing monetary awards in cases such as these circumvent the basic concept of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide compensation to those persons only who were dependent upon the deceased employee and were deprived by his death of a means of support. I expressed the view that it was wise and reasonable for the Congress to make the program provided by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, even though circumscribed in some respects, the exclusive form of recovery from the Government. A Federal employee and his dependents, for whatever other rights of redress they surrender, get in return the assured and orderly protection, independent of the question of fault or negligence, which the law guarantees to them and their surviving dependents when death occurs during employment. I further said that I could find no reason why this principle should apply to the judicial process and not prevail in the legislative process.

S. 1045 is inconsistent with the principles of the dependency requirements and the exclusive remedy provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, even though the exclusive remedy section was not added until 1949. If the Congress believes there is reason to depart from the policy of this act, in order to permit payment of death compensation to a nondependent husband of a Federal employee, I believe this should be done through general legislation rather than by making individual exceptions through the enactment of private relief measures. Such private relief enactments, in effect, would provide preferential treatment for some individuals and would be discriminatory against the general class of persons subject to the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 21, 1952.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 6661. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Building Act, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 1586).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 4801. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for flood-control purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1587);

H. R. 4802. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain public improvement bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1588);

H. R. 4923. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads; without amendment (Rept. No. 1589);

H. R. 5071. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream; without amendment (Rept. No. 1590);

H. R. 5072. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1591);

H. R. 5386. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue bonds for acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of buildings for public-school purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1592); and

H. R. 6675. A bill to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa Unified School District for use for school purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1593).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2610. A bill providing that excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental or regulated water supply from the San Luis Valley project, Colorado; without amendment (Rept. No. 1594).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 21, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 897) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thanos Mellos, Michel Mellos, and Hermine Fahn.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 3207. A bill for the relief of Panos Michalopoulos;

S. 3208. A bill for the relief of Paul Dacut;

S. 3209. A bill for the relief of Virginia Grande; and

S. 3210. A bill for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 3211. A bill for the relief of Shizuko Suzuki and Johnny Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 3212. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Midvale irrigation district and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES) (by request):

S. 3213. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 3214. A bill for the relief of Ottavio Saulino and Marcella Saulino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3215. A bill for the relief of Julia E. Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK):

S. 3216. A bill to provide for a television studio to be maintained in connection with the Senate Radio-Television Correspondents' Gallery; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY — AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2550, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HUNT, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. KEM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the executive offices and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi;

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of Ethel White, Frankie Ezell, and Ralph James;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of Margaret Frankel;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of James Nels Ekberg;

H. R. 2840. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa;

H. R. 3334. An act for the relief of Paul Busbey;

H. R. 3564. An act for the relief of Reuben Krakovsky;

H. R. 3858. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon;

H. R. 4126. An act for the relief of Ernst Sbaschnik, Sr.;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;

H. R. 4504. An act for the relief of Dr. Philipp Bloemsma and Mrs. Joy Roelink Bloemsma;

H. R. 4543. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla Crowley;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Mark Yen Hui;

H. R. 5107. An act for the relief of Margarine Mary Fujita;

H. R. 5108. An act for the relief of Nicola Lucia, and Rocco Fierro;

H. R. 5301. An act for the relief of Leonard Jesse Richards (Michio Inoue);

H. R. 5325. An act for the relief of S. Irby Adams;

H. R. 5864. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi;

H. R. 6010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lenzie G. Clarkson and William E. Clarkson;

H. R. 6016. An act for the relief of Louis A. Schafer;

H. R. 6109. An act for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz;

H. R. 6505. An act for the relief of Karen Ann Crowley;

H. R. 6850. An act for the relief of Martha Bridges;

H. R. 6870. An act for the relief of Louie Bon Kong; and

H. R. 6945. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoffmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7860. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 454. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by him at the annual State convention banquet of the Catholic War Veterans, Department of Pennsylvania, at Norristown, Pa., on May 17, 1952.

By Mr. PASTORE:

Statement prepared by him, entitled "The Story of Social Security."

By Mr. THYE:

Address entitled "A Look at the Record," delivered by him before the Minnesota Hennepin County Republican Women's Club, Minneapolis, Minn., on May 16, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Thye for the Soil," published in St. Paul Pioneer Press on May 14, 1952.

By Mr. CAIN:

Letter written by him to Mr. John Oakes, of the editorial department of the New York Times, with reference to the tidelands bill.

By Mr. TAPT:

Editorial entitled "We Can Depend on ANDY," relating to Senator SCHOEPPEL, published in the Kingman (Kans.) Journal of May 15, 1952.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Article entitled "The Missouri Gang: A National Issue," published in the Reader's Digest.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Resolution adopted by the American Bar Association on the tidelands issue.

By Mr. MOODY:

Editorial entitled "Not Yet Perfected," commenting on the immigration bill, published in the Detroit News of Saturday, May 10, 1952.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Editorial entitled "Chennault's Planes," published in the New York Times of May 7, 1952.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Editorial entitled "No Wonder Our Cities Lack So Much," published in the Deseret (Utah) News of May 18, 1952.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Article entitled "The Amazing Mrs. Mayes," written by Dorothy Brandon and published in a recent issue of the magazine section of the New York Herald Tribune.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

Article regarding Miss Geneva Harrison, a teacher of blind children, published in a recent issue of the Washington Post.

THE KOJE ISLAND INCIDENT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, this morning a Miss Isabel Grasty, who identified herself as a relative of Brig. Gen. Francis T. Dodd, former commander of the Kojé Island war prisoner camp, called at my office and stated to my executive assistant that General Dodd had received orders from superiors in the Army to coddle and appease the Communist prisoners on Kojé Island.

This is a serious charge that should be investigated fully by the proper committees of Congress and not just by the Army itself. If General Dodd did receive such orders, it should be fully determined not only who gave the orders but as well who formulated the policy for such orders—whether such policy was formulated by the Army or by the State Department or by the White House.

INCREASE IN PRICE OF CANADIAN NEWSPRINT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, in a statement in the Senate on Monday, regarding the announced new increase in price of Canadian newsprint, I declared that the Office of Price Stabilization should make it eminently clear to the Canadian authorities that the people of our country resented this apparent desire on the part of the Canadian manufacturers to take advantage of their monopolistic position at the expense of this Nation's newspapers.

I am happy to advise the Senate that the Office of Price Stabilization, through former Gov. Ellis Arnall, its able Director, conferred with ranking officials of the Canadian Government on this matter last Wednesday and later protested the proposed increase to the Canadian

Minister of Defense Production as both shocking and alarming.

Mr. Arnall conferred with representatives of the American Newsprint Publishers Association regarding the matter and presented their views to the Canadian Defense Minister.

I am very happy to bring to the attention of the Senate and of our people, generally, the active and alert interest of Mr. Arnall and the Office of Price Stabilization in this matter, which represents an additional burden upon newspapers and, of course, eventually upon the American public.

INTERPRETATION OF PRESIDENT'S INHERENT POWER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 4, 1952, containing remarks by our distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO END THE CONFUSION IN STEEL—NEED MANDATORY LAWS ON PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY POWERS—INTERPRETATION OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S INHERENT POWER BY SUPREME COURT ALSO REQUIRED, SENATOR MORSE BELIEVES—JUSTICES JACKSON AND CLARK ARE ON RECORD IN FAVOR OF BROAD POWERS OF THE PRESIDENCY

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—The bewildering confusion during the week started by Federal Judge Pine's decision that the Government was in illegal possession of the steel plants brought into sharp focus the ever-recurring but as yet unanswered question of the extent of Presidential power in a national emergency.

The United States district judge's clear-cut conclusion that in his opinion the President has only the power delegated him by the Constitution and voted him by the Congress pointed up two current needs in the current critical period of neither-peace-nor-war.

These are:

1. Interpretation by the Supreme Court of the President's inherent powers as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the armed services.

2. Mandatory, rather than permissive or discretionary legislation that would more definitely outline for a President what he can and cannot do in a national emergency. Use of the Taft-Hartley Act is discretionary with the President.

The need for clarification and definition was emphasized late yesterday when five of the nine justices of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which stayed Judge Pine's injunction against the Government, said there was "at least a serious question" in their minds about the correctness of the lower court's opinion.

After citing cases going back to 1871, the majority of the appellate court appeared to be answering Judge Pine's conclusion that there was utter and complete lack of authoritative support for the Government's position in the steel seizure.

Until the Supreme Court acts there will be continued confusion about Presidential powers.

The principal advocate in Congress for a Supreme Court interpretation of the inherent power of the President and for mandatory power to the President in national crisis is Republican WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

With his background as dean of the Oregon University Law School he speaks as the Senate's most articulate student of constitutional law. His services on various World War II boards and his membership on the Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare Committees in the Senate have given him detailed information on military requirements and labor-management relations.

During the coal dispute of 1950, which in some respects was similar to the current steel controversy, Morse introduced a bill that set out step-by-step procedures under which the Government could seize and operate an essential industry in a national emergency. It was not acted upon by the Senate.

Agreement by the Supreme Court today to review the steel seizure case opens the way to a possible definition of the "inherent" power that Judge Pine said did not exist.

The highest court, while tacitly recognizing over the years the exercise of extraordinary powers by the President as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief, has carefully avoided specific expressions that could be used generally as definition of this vague power that has been invoked by almost every President from Thomas Jefferson to Harry S. Truman.

Two members of the present Court, Justices Jackson and Clark, are on record, while Attorneys General, upholding the President's powers to act in an emergency without specified authority.

The situation most nearly analogous to the present situation but on a much smaller scale, was in June 1941, 6 months before the attack on Pearl Harbor but during a declared "emergency," when President Roosevelt took possession of the North American Aviation Corp. plant at Englewood, Calif.

Jackson, as Attorney General, had advised the President on his legal power of seizure and the Department of Justice made public the following statement by him:

"The Presidential proclamation rests upon the aggregate of the Presidential powers derived from the Constitution itself and from statutes enacted by the Congress.

"The Constitution lays upon the President the duty 'to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.' Among the laws which he is required to find means to execute are those which direct him to equip an enlarged Army, to provide for a strengthened Navy, to protect Government property, to protect those who are engaged in carrying out the business of the Government, and to carry out the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act.

"For the faithful execution of such laws the President has back of him not only each general law enforcement power conferred by the various acts of Congress, but the aggregate of all such laws, plus that wide discretion as to method vested in him by the Constitution for the purpose of executing the laws.

"The Constitution also places on the President the responsibility, and vests in him, the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy. These weapons for the protection of the continued existence of the Nation are placed in his sole command and the implication is clear that he should not allow them to become paralyzed by failure to obtain supplies for which Congress has appropriated the money and which it has directed the President to obtain.

"The situation in the North American plant more nearly resembles an insurrection than a labor strike. The President's proclamation recites the persistent defiance of Government efforts to mediate any legitimate labor differences. The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of labor grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlements; they want strikes.

"That is the Communist Party line which those who have defied both the Government and their own loyal leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed.

"There can be no doubt that the duty constitutionally and inherently rested upon the President to exert his civil and military, as well as his moral authority to keep the defense effort of the United States a going concern."

Earlier the late Frank Murphy, then Attorney General and later an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, was asked by a Senate resolution to specify the powers Roosevelt might exercise under his proclamation of a national emergency.

Murphy politely declined, citing statutes and precedents dating back to the early days of the Nation which held that the Attorney General should give his interpretation of law to the President and heads of executive agencies. But Murphy added, in a letter to Vice President John N. Garner dated October 4, 1939:

"You are aware, of course, that the Executive has powers not enumerated in the statutes—powers derived not from statutory grants but from the Constitution.

"It is universally recognized that the constitutional duties of the Executive carry with them the constitutional powers necessary for their performance.

"These constitutional powers have never been specifically defined, and in fact cannot be, since their extent and limitations are largely dependent upon conditions and circumstances.

"In a measure this is true with respect to most of the powers of the Executive, both constitutional and statutory. The right to take specific action might not exist under one state of facts, while under another it might be the absolute duty of the Executive to take such action."

Years later Tom C. Clark, then Attorney General, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, followed the same line of thought, and in fact cited Murphy's letter on the point.

Clark's views were expressed in a letter to former Senator Elbert D. Thomas, then chairman of the Senate Labor committee, which was considering legislation to repeal or modify the Taft-Hartley Act. The pertinent portion of the letter, written February 2, 1949, dealt with Clark's reference to national emergency injunction procedures. On this point he wrote:

"However, with regard to the question of the power of the Government under Title III (the national emergency injunction section) I might point out that the inherent power of the President to deal with emergencies that affect the health, safety, and welfare of the entire Nation is exceedingly great."

Neither layman nor lawyer should have the temerity to predict what any Supreme Court would do with such a controversial issue as the steel seizure even though two present members have expressed themselves—as Attorneys General—on inherent power. It is fairly safe, however, to observe that in most cases, the Supreme Court has tried to limit itself to the narrowest possible issue and has avoided decision when circumstances rendered the issue moot.

Before Judge Pine handed down his decision adverse to the Government on Tuesday, Senator MORSE was emphatic that the President was endowed by the Constitution with unspecified powers to deal with an emergency. After the decision he was equally emphatic about his own views but conceded that he had been "reversed" by the Federal District court here.

"So long as that decision stands," he said on Thursday, "I shall urge full compliance with it because it is the law of the land unless reversed.

At one point, MORSE appeared to welcome Judge Pine's decision because it opened the way for a definition by the Supreme Court. He noted that the lower court's opinion "still fails clearly to define what Executive power under the Constitution means."

Pointing out that there had been a divergence of view during nearly the entire life of the Republic about the President's power to meet a crisis before Congress could act, MORSE continued:

"Very able scholars and lawyers have stood on both sides of this question. It has been my view and still is my view that the President has broader powers than Judge Pine decreed in his decision the other day. It is my opinion that it would be a great mistake to adopt any tactic for the settlement of this litigation which would avoid placing this issue squarely before the Supreme Court.

"I think it would be most unfortunate if future Presidents, confronted with great crises, should find their freedom of action impaired by the decision of a lower Federal court. I think future Presidents, as well as the present President, are entitled to a clear-cut unequivocal decision on the basic issue involved in this case and a clear determination by the Supreme Court as to what the undefined language in Article II of the Constitution means as a matter of constitutional law.

"I think it is important that such a clear decision come from the Supreme Court, because the decision is now the important thing. Let us find out, now, whether the narrow interpretation of the Constitution as set forth by Judge Pine is the law of the land. The only place where that question can be determined ultimately finally is in the Supreme Court of the United States."

Commenting specifically on Judge Pine's opinion, the Oregon Senator said:

"I say most respectfully that in my opinion Judge Pine's decision is one of those decisions on constitutional law in which the court looks upon the Constitution as a static instrument and not as a dynamic instrument; as a dead-hand instrument, not as a living instrument, adjustable to the dynamic needs of a society living under changing conditions, generation to generation.

"The great strength of the American Constitution has always been its flexible nature, in that it has been interpreted for the most part as a dynamic instrument, adjustable to changing conditions as they confront the free people of this country."

Getting back to the steel seizure, MORSE said that Truman in this instance and others, should have consulted with Congress before acting and if possible obtained legislation to authorize his action. He stated that in some cases the President might have had to act before getting congressional sanction, as President Wilson had done when he sent the marines to Nicaragua.

He said that Truman's letter to Vice President BARKLEY calling on Congress to take such action as it saw fit was not enough.

"After all," he continued, "the operation of Government is also a matter of human relations, and I think the attitude and understanding would have been entirely different in Congress and in the country had we been told, even that night (of the seizure) or the first thing the next morning, that the President sought to address a joint session of the Congress to discuss this case.

"I am inclined to think that, had that course of action been followed, we would not be in the situation we are at present in the steel case. But what I say about spilled milk or water over the dam does not change the fact now, and the fact now is that our country is losing, hour by hour, steel production which the safety of America requires."

When MORSE was speaking, the steel workers were still off the job. They began to return yesterday but MORSE and other Con-

gressmen and Senators have been trying to devise legislation that would keep essential production going in an emergency.

In the past, Congress has shied away from legislation that would take away the workers' right to strike in the last resort or specifically to authorize the President, in peacetime, to seize an industry even in an emergency.

MORSE's solution is for the Congress to take an affirmative position and legislate.

"I cannot escape the feeling," he told the Senate this week, "that we are in rather an indefensible position when we argue as a Congress in one breath that the President acted without any legislative sanction, and yet have not put legislation on the books either before or after the fact in coping with the objection we have made. I hold to the point of view that we ought to keep the President in check by way of legislation before and after the fact in matter such as this; and it ought to be mandatory legislation. I repeat that legislation—it ought to be mandatory legislation."

Various proposals along this line have been made for providing the Government with authority for seizing and operating an industry during a period of national emergency.

The latest is a bill introduced in the House Wednesday by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, coauthor of the wartime Smith-Connally Labor Disputes Act. Under the Smith bill the Government would have power to appoint receivers for union and management to operate an industry indefinitely during the emergency.

The costs of the receivership would be borne equally by labor and management, but there is no provision for the deposition of profits. Wages and conditions of employment would remain in status quo.

A more detailed and carefully thought out seizure plan has been proposed by Senator MORSE. He broached this first in 1947 during debate on the Taft-Hartley Act and introduced it in the form of a bill in March 1950 during a coal strike.

The essence of MORSE's measure was an effort to be fair to both sides in the dispute. His basic premise was that it should be used only as a last resort, after breakdown of collective bargaining. He tried to make certain that his procedure could not be used arbitrarily by the President, but could be brought into play only after careful consideration was given to the recommendations of an Emergency Board both by the President and by Congress.

MORSE told the Senate in offering his legislation that his 15 years of experience in the field of labor relations had convinced him the human factor is controlling in most labor disputes. An opponent of the Taft-Hartley Act, MORSE told the Senate that workers have an entirely different psychological outlook toward working under Government seizure and control of profits than working for a private employer, who controls the profits, against their will.

Procedure under MORSE's bill would be as follows:

When the President finds a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he is to issue a proclamation to that effect and call on the parties to the dispute to stay on the job, or, if they have left it, to go back to work.

Then the President is to appoint an "Emergency Board" to investigate and try to settle the dispute within 30 days. The report is to be made public. The size of the board is left to the President's discretion.

Any time after issuing the proclamation the President may submit to Congress for action a full statement of the case and any recommendations he sees fit to make.

MUST MAKE STATEMENT

The bill makes it mandatory on the President to submit such a statement if a strike or lockout continues after the proclamation is issued. He is also to submit the report of the Emergency Board if it has been made and may recommend that the United States take possession of and operate the enterprise.

If he recommends possession, he is given automatically the authority to take the action unless Congress within 5 days adopts a concurrent resolution stating the action should not be taken or unless Congress passes legislation intended to resolve the dispute and terminate the emergency, if Congress finds an emergency exists.

During the period of Government possession the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Emergency Board are to continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the opposing parties.

The agency or department of Government designated by the President to operate the enterprise under seizure would have no authority to negotiate with the employer or the union for a contract or to alter the wages, hours, or conditions of employment existing in the industry before the dispute, except in conformity with the recommendations of the emergency board of congressional resolution.

The seized property would be returned to the owners as soon as they reached an agreement and settled the dispute with the employees or when the President finds that continued Government operation was no longer necessary under the terms of the proclamation.

The bill provided, however, that possession by the Government would be terminated not later than 60 days after the issuance of the report of the emergency board unless the period of possession was extended by Congress.

The United States would hold all income in trust, paying just compensation to the owners, paying operating expenses, reimbursing the Government and depositing any remaining receipts in the Treasury.

COMPENSATION

Compensation to the owners would be determined by a board appointed by the President. The award would be final and binding on both parties unless within 30 days after the issuance of the award either party moved to have the award modified or set aside in the United States Court of Claims according to the rules of the court.

In determining just compensation to the owners, consideration would be given to the fact that the Government took possession of the enterprise when its operation had been interrupted by a work stoppage, or that a work stoppage was imminent; to the fact that the owners or the labor union failed or refused to comply with the recommendations of the emergency board or the conditions determined by the Congress to constitute a just settlement of the dispute; to the fact that the Government would have returned the enterprise to its owners at any time when an agreement was reached settling the dispute; and to the value of the use of the enterprise would have had to its owners in the light of the labor dispute prevailing, had the owners remained in possession during the period of Government operation.

While the facility is under Government possession it is to be the duty of labor organizations and their officers to seek in good faith to induce employees to refrain from work stoppages and not to engage in a strike, slow-down, or refusal to work. If such work stoppage occurred, the leaders should try in good faith to induce the employees to return to their jobs.

During the period of possession, the labor and management representatives would be obligated to continue collective bargaining.

DOUBT

A point emphasized repeatedly by Morse was the element of doubt. He said that unless the disputants were kept in doubt about what the final settlement might be after Government intervention "we play right into the hands of either labor's or the employer's side of the table, which may find it to their advantage to let the procedures of the law run their course."

"In my bill I have left the parties in doubt," Morse said. "I do not propose a law which would allow either side to sit down and figure out in advance whether it will be to its advantage to look out the window when collective bargaining should be going on in good faith and say, 'No, no, no' to offers made by the other side. I have phrased this bill so that both will be in great doubt as to the economic consequences if they permit a situation to develop such a national emergency that it threatens the health and safety of the country to the extent that the Government has to step in and exercise the arm of the law to protect the public welfare.

"How have I done it? I have done it by leaving to the Government to determine, when seizure has been applied, what the wages, hours, and conditions of employment shall be and what the compensation of operators shall be. Mine is a flexible procedure as far as economic compensation to both parties under Government seizure is concerned."

INCOME IN TRUST

Under Morse's bill, during the period of Government operation all income would be held in trust for the payment of general operating expenses and just compensation to the owners. This compensation would be based on the facts in each individual case.

If employers were shown by the facts in the recommendations of the emergency board to have been guilty of bad faith, and if it is shown that they should have granted some of the requests of the union, the compensation to the owners would not be as much as in a case in which the board found the union at fault.

This would infuse the element of doubt into the procedure, he said.

All expenses incurred by the Government would be reimbursed out of the income from the operation, if anything remained it would be turned into the United States Treasury.

It is impossible to forecast whether the Morse bill or anything like it would have prevented the steel seizure. There probably will always remain a question about what extraordinary powers a President can exercise in an emergency. There is even the question whether Congress or the courts could define an emergency, especially in these times of Soviet imperialism and worldwide rearmament.

The Supreme Court could, however, begin to answer the question by setting up some boundaries on the President's unspecified powers and the Congress could be more explicit in stating what it thinks the President can and cannot legally do as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief.

ALLAN B. KLINE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] made a very forceful statement, during the course of which he submitted a list of certain individuals who I am afraid some persons may be led to think are all and sundry in complete support of and in cooperation with the New Deal of recent years.

Because of personal acquaintance, I wish to invite attention to one individual to whom the Senator from In-

diana referred. I believe I should add a little bit more to the chronology and history of this gentleman, because he is a long-time personal friend of mine and one of the outstanding men in the United States—Allan B. Kline. I think all his associations and activities were not included in the little biography contained in the statement appearing on page 5559 of the RECORD of yesterday.

The reference to Mr. Kline is as follows:

Allan B. Kline: Government post: Public Advisory Board, Economic Cooperation Administration. Business connections: president, Iowa Life Insurance Co., 1945-47; president, Iowa Farm Mutual Insurance Co., 1944; president, Iowa Plant Food Co., 1945-47; director, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

Mr. President, the persons to whom the Senator from Indiana referred were classified in the RECORD as being tycoons of industry. I am perfectly willing to admit that Allan Kline is one of the outstanding persons in the United States, in his field, but he is not exactly in the classification of a tycoon of industry. He is a practical and thoroughly successful and devoted dirt farmer in Iowa. That is his business and his occupation. He has been active in farm organization work. He was president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation for several terms and has just been reelected to a third term as president of the National Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. Kline is, at the present time, I believe, a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, but he is what is called a class C director. He is not a banker and is not interested in any bank, and he owns not a single share of bank stock. So Mr. Kline is not a director as the result of being a banker in the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to say that I know Mr. Kline and have known him for many years. In my judgment, there are very few men in the country who have as sound and complete knowledge of economics as has Mr. Kline.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. The Senator from Indiana was not attempting in any way to disparage Mr. Kline.

So far as Mr. Kline's being president of a life-insurance company is concerned, he was, in effect, ex-officio president as the result of his being elected president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation. When he ceased being president of that federation he ceased being an officer of the life-insurance company.

He holds, or has held until recently, the post of public advisory member of the Economic Cooperation Administration. I am reliably informed that it was not with the blessing or the approval of the present administration that he was appointed to that post. His appointment was made over the objection of the administration, and it was because of his unique ability along that line.

Mr. TOBEY. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that Mr. Kline has forgotten more about such matters than some of us have ever dreamed of.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Kline is a brilliant man, and I agree generally with the Senator from New Hampshire.

I wanted to make it clear, because of my long acquaintance with Mr. Kline, that he is not in any sense a business tycoon. He is an Iowa dirt farmer with brilliant mental qualifications for the service of the people among whom he lives. He has been president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation for several terms and is now president of the National Farm Bureau Federation. He is a man of the soil and, furthermore, he is a man of great brilliance, great patriotism, and a determination to serve his country and his people.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am delighted that the senior Senator from Iowa has said what he has, because it gives me an opportunity to say that in making the speech which I made yesterday and placing in the RECORD the names of more than a hundred businessmen who have been associated with the Government, no effort was made to distinguish Republicans and Democrats, and no effort was made to distinguish between big- and small-business men. I felt that all businessmen, big and little, and all farmers, labor leaders, and everyone else ought to take part in government, and that when called upon by the President of the United States or any other high governmental official, they should participate and make the required sacrifice.

What I was trying to point out was that, although these men have over a period of years made great sacrifices and great contributions to the Government, yet the President of the United States is continually harassing them and using almost every term in the dictionary in describing them as men of privilege, condemning them and complaining that the party which I represent is the party of big business.

I simply wanted to show how much hypocrisy the President himself was indulging in when he made such a speech as that to which I made reference and such as he continually makes.

Mr. President, I know Allan Kline. I have known him for years, and I know that he is a dirt farmer in Iowa. In fact, he is one of the successful farmers. He raises a great many hogs and a great deal of corn. He has contributed much to the Government and has offered his services wherever he had an opportunity to do so. He has been against those things in Government which he felt were wrong, and he has likewise been for those things which he felt were right.

I, for one, am becoming tired of hearing the President of the United States single out businessmen in the United States, both small and big, who have contributed to the Government, whom the President personally asked to contribute and to become members of his official family, and then proceed to belittle them and try to make the people of America believe they are a sinister force. He proceeds to call them all sorts of uncomplimentary names, and tries to tell the American people that all the big businessmen in the United States are in the Republican Party. I for one have been getting tired of it, as I did particularly after listening to the President's address a few days ago before the Americans for Democratic Action. I thought that we ought to get the record straight, that we ought simply to show up that kind of speech and that kind of conversation for what it is—just a lot of poppycock. That was the reason why I presented the information for the RECORD. I think that by doing so I contributed a service to the thinking of the American people.

It was not my intention to show that many of those whom the President mentioned were either for or against the so-called New Deal, as the able Senator from Iowa said. That was not the point at all. The point was simply to show that men, like those whose names were on the list I presented, do join the Government from time to time, and make their contribution to the conduct of the Government. Yet they are condemned by the President of the United States, I presume, for having been a little successful in their particular lines of endeavor.

That leads me to ask, when has it become a sin in America to be successful? When has it become a sin in America to make money? Yet the President of the United States would leave the impression with the people of America, or would like to leave the impression, that any man who is in any degree successful, or has some sort of success motive, belongs to the Republican Party only. I presume the inference might be drawn, if one wishes to turn it around the other way, that the unsuccessful people in America belong to the New Deal party, and the successful people belong to the Republican Party.

I might even use names. The able junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who is standing across the aisle, is a very wealthy man who has been successful in his business. Evidently he is one, I presume, to whom the President of the United States is referring when he talks about men of privilege in Wall Street.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am quite sure the President of the United States did not have me in mind in his remarks. I wish to point out to the junior Senator from Indiana that I have not been in Wall Street for almost 25 years. I retired from active business when I first went into public life in 1929.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am delighted to know that; but I am certain that we are not going to have to pass the hat for the able Senator from New York.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to take a very few minutes of the time of the Senate to refresh the memory of the Senate on certain aspects of the pending bill. I was very much gratified by the response in my State of West Virginia in the last election, in a campaign based on the record of solid achievements of the national Democratic administration.

I should like to remind the Senate that one of the important features of that record was the enactment of a humane, liberal, displaced-persons law. The first such law passed by the Congress was full of restrictions and limitations, and it did not work. When the life of that law expired, another bill came from the Committee on the Judiciary, but that bill was just as restrictive as the first bill, if not more so.

On the floor of the Senate a new bill was drawn. It was liberal and humane, and has proved workable to such an extent that in August of this year the displaced-persons situation will have been cleared up so far as our obligations and commitments are concerned. As I said, that bill was written on the floor of the Senate, and it is my hope that as to the pending bill similar action can be taken to make the bill workable.

Mr. President, we speak about immigration as if all our people did not come from abroad; as if we were all natives. Everyone of us is a descendant of immigrants, be our name Dworshak, Schoepel, Mundt, Lehman, Malone, Kilgore, Humphrey, or O'Mahoney. We are all descendants of immigrants, and our ancestors came here at a time when they were welcome. I well remember when immigrants were brought here from Italy and other countries of Europe by the boatload, in order to build our railroads, to help mine our coal, to help build the industries of this Nation, then in their period of construction. Now we look askance at anyone who happened to be born in Italy, Spain, France, Belgium, or Holland.

It is true that immigration from the British Isles—England, Scotland, and Ireland—has dwindled to such an extent that those countries do not use their quotas. But there are still many desirable people in other countries of Europe who could readily and gladly take advantage of the unused quotas. That is why I was very sorry to see the amendment in the nature of a substitute defeated.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that the pending bill, which is a complete rewriting of the immigration laws, instead of curing inequities, unfortunately creates new ones. Let me cite an example. A man in my State came from Hungary at the age of 16. He was the only son of a prominent Hungarian family, and he settled in West Virginia. He went into business, became well known and prominent, was naturalized, and reared a family. Shortly before Hitler went on the rampage, the man to whom I refer was called back to Hungary, since he was the only son of the family, to settle the estate of his father, who had recently died, and who had owned considerable land in Hungary. He

was caught in Hungary by the Nazi invasion and was placed in an internment camp, together with his eldest son, who had accompanied his father as his legal adviser. He was kept there during the entire war. Then, when the Communists moved into Hungary, he was placed in another concentration camp, because the Communists did not like him.

Yet that man, although he believed in our form of government, lost his American citizenship by reason of being confined in an internment camp for more than 5 years and again became a subject of Hungary, which is now behind the iron curtain. There are many cases similar to the one I have just described, and I could cite many from my own State.

Mr. President, in the consideration of a bill aimed at a codification of the immigration laws provision should be made to take care of such cases as this. Of course, when the original law was drafted, no one ever thought that concentration camps would exist for five or more years. No one thought that the seas would not be safe for navigation for more than 5 or 6 years. The time has come to cure the manifest inequities which exist, and there are many of them. For instance, recently the United States Senate passed a bill to permit a specialist in watch manufacturing to become an immigrant and subject to naturalization, legislative action being necessary simply because there had been lodged against this man in Switzerland a charge designed to keep him from becoming an American citizen, and going to work in the watch-manufacturing industry. The industry wanted his services; they were necessary to improve American production; but Congress had to pass a special act to remove the obstacle. Instead of making people welcome in accordance with the inscription on the famous Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, it seems that we are striving by this bill to make the situation worse. We place 21 more roadblocks in the way of people coming to this country. We should not cease looking at the woods because we want to see a tree or two.

We always consider that aliens coming to this country come here in order to become citizens. Actually many of them come as visitors or students, or for business reasons; yet they are faced with the same hardships and the same suspicions.

I know of one case, involving a girl from Greece whose brother is a prominent citizen of my State. She had not seen her brother for about 15 years. She wanted to visit him. She had no idea of remaining in this country, because her mother and brothers were in Greece, where they have a beautiful home, and she wanted to stay there. But she wanted to see her brother. She applied for a visitor's visa, but casually asked the question, "Is the Greek quota full?" On the basis of that one question her application was rejected, because it was suspected that she was trying to get in on a visitor's visa in order to become a permanent immigrant. Her word to the effect that she must take care of her mother and remain with the family was totally disregarded.

There are other cases of a similar nature, under the 5-year rule. A woman who was approaching 70, all of whose relatives were in the United States, she being an American citizen, lost her citizenship because of the fact that the war intervened while she and her husband were abroad. Now she cannot even obtain a visitor's visa, because it is suspected that she wants to come back here to stay, since her relatives are in this country and are citizens of the United States.

We must have in mind such cases in considering amendments to the pending legislation. Since the substitute could not be adopted, I hope Members of this body will take into consideration the many inequities which now exist. They should be cured before we throw more stumbling blocks in the road and build up further suspicion and greater ill feeling among peoples who might otherwise be our friends.

Under the terms of the bill which was enacted by Congress, any Spanish citizen who might have been compelled to join the Falangist group of Spain in order to live, was precluded from obtaining a visa to visit this country. That law automatically barred every Spaniard. Feeling against the United States was not too good in Spain. We in this country, and particularly we in the Senate who deal with foreign relations, should realize that we should not throw brickbats at our neighbors across the sea by the passage of laws calculated to antagonize them.

I do not want to invite subversive types of people to come into the United States. I want to keep them out. I do not want to exceed the quota which was fixed a long time ago. I want to see people come in who are healthy, good, and intelligent. At the same time, let us not throw artificial stumbling blocks in their way, so as to make their visit to America either impossible or so unpleasant as to make them give up hope.

SILVER JUBILEE YEAR OF THEODORE GRANIK'S AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the beginning of the silver jubilee year of Theodore Granik's American Forum of the Air, an occasion already noted by the well-known newspaper columnist, Walter Winchell, and others, brings to mind the tremendous strides made by this great public-service broadcast in the last 24 years.

Two Presidents of our Nation, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and the present Chief Executive, Harry S. Truman, have been guest speakers during its span on the air, as well as Vice Presidents, Cabinet members, industrialists, sports figures, and other noted personalities. So it is not surprising that Walter Winchell should single out Mr. Granik's public-interest program recently and describe it in the Washington Post and in his far-flung syndication of many hundreds of newspapers as interesting, enlightening, and darn good.

It is not hard for me to agree heartily with Mr. Winchell's discerning comment

on Mr. Granik's broadcast. Of course, nostalgia also prompts me to recall that I was among the first guests to appear on the program now known as American Forum of the Air more than 24 years ago. I have since watched its progress through the years and now can only add my words of appreciation to those of Walter Winchell.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. I join the distinguished Senator from New York in the tribute he has just paid to Mr. Granik and his great program. I have an interest in programs of this kind, because over a period of almost 10 years I was responsible for the programing of the University of Chicago Round Table, a program of similar objectives, a public-service program aimed at the education and illumination of the public.

Mr. Granik has conducted one of the few consistently distinguished public service programs in the radio field. Furthermore, he has been extremely skillful in his ability to handle the networks and the commercial interests with which he has been surrounded in maintaining a good period of time and a consistently high quality of output. I am delighted that the Senator from New York takes this occasion to give him the public notice which I think is his due.

PRICE OF COPPER

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at 5 o'clock today the OPS issued a press release. They plan to let copper wire and brass mills charge more for their products when made of imported copper and the Office of Defense Mobilization has announced that the Office of Price Stabilization would permit copper wire and brass mills to add to their ceiling prices 80 percent of the increase in cost of foreign copper above the 27½ cents a pound specified in the old Chilean agreement. Chile has been seeking a price of 33 or 34 cents a pound. Acting Director John R. Steelman, of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in issuing the announcement, barred any change in domestic-copper prices in these words:

It is the policy of the United States Government not to make now and to avoid in the future changes in the existing price ceilings on domestically refined copper, brass mill scrap, or copper alloy scrap.

The Office of Defense Mobilization said that the only alternative to breaking the price line would be a Government-purchase program, with the Government absorbing the higher import price in making resales to American users.

I merely wish to say that while this is a move in the right direction, the Senator from Michigan has been urging for some time that the whole difficulty in connection with the shortage of copper and other commodities is the result of the International Materials Conference, an international cartel, which we entered, prohibiting our domestic producers and users from obtaining copper and other materials except as permitted under the international cartel.

Mr. President, the press release mentions only copper wire and brass mills. I trust the order will not be limited to copper wire and brass mills only, because it would exclude manufactured articles used domestically, such as household articles and many other products, including automobiles. Apparently no other relief would be provided. The Production Authority states that there is no alternative but a Government purchasing program. I do not agree. I wish they had read the terms of a bill which I introduced, S. 2873, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of Senate bill 2873 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, then no restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States. No restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title if the domestic production of any commodity is sufficient to meet all civilian domestic requirements and the requirements for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress."

SEC. 2. Section 402 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) No rule, regulation, or order issued under this title shall apply to purchases by any person of any material outside of the United States or its Territories and possessions for importation into the United States for his own use or for fabrication by him into other products for resale."

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill provides:

If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, then no restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States.

The enactment of the bill would have corrected the situation this new order attempts to relieve. The enactment of my bill would permit purchase of commodities such as copper, and their use in many articles, and would eliminate the necessity for obtaining so-called CMP tickets for the purchase of certain commodities such as copper.

Mr. President, it is very significant that the press announcement should be made at 5 o'clock today. Earlier today it was given to the Committee on Banking and Currency, where my bill was being considered as a part of the revision of the Defense Production Act. I hope that the committee will not allow merely this partial relief, but that it will consider my bill and incorporate it in the new act. It is essential that they do so from the standpoint of not only the automobile manufacturers, but many other

manufacturers who use copper, and many other commodities.

I should say that the cost of the copper used in the manufacture of some of these articles is insignificant when compared with the price of the whole article. If the various users of copper were permitted to go into the foreign market—and that is all that we are asking—to buy copper and bring it to this country, the manufacturers would get the relief they are entitled to. A partial relief is being provided. I hope it will not defeat my bill, for we must do away with the international cartel so that our present standard of living will not be reduced.

I make these remarks because the press release came out at this time, when my bill is being considered in the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive P, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a consular convention between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on May 1, 1950; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 8);

Executive N, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a protocol between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on March 3, 1952, supplementary to the consular convention which was signed at Dublin on May 1, 1950; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 8); and

Executive O, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a consular convention and an accompanying protocol of signature between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on June 6, 1951; without reservations (Ex. Rept. No. 8).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, May 21 (legislative day of May 12), 1952:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant scientists, effective date of acceptance:

Albert L. Burroughs Richard H. Foote
Clifford O. Berg Clarence A. Sooter

To be senior assistant sanitarian, effective date of acceptance:

William D. Sudia

Assistant surgeon to be senior assistant surgeon:

Harold M. Silver

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers:

Henry J. L. Rechen Frederick S. Kent

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Glenn Oscar Barcus, 87A, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, Fifth Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general with date of rank from date of appointment, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named midshipman, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 3, 1952, upon his graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Mitchell Daniel Charneski

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Allied Forces, southern Europe.

Vice Adm. Jerauld Wright, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander in chief, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 21 (legislative day of May 12), 1952:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

To be Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America
William Sanders

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Windsor G. Hackler
Charles K. Moffly
Donald E. Webster

To be Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Miss Bernice M. Strawn

To be Foreign Service officer of class 5, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Arthur P. Allen

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Una B. Duren, Quinton.

ALASKA

Dorothy Z. Sadlier, Pelican.

ARIZONA

Marie L. Porter, Apache Junction.

ARKANSAS

Nellie J. Murphy, Calion.
James A. Morris, Fordyce.
Garland McGrew, Mountain Pine.

CALIFORNIA

Trusten P. Jennings, Chatsworth.
Edward E. Briggs, Los Gatos.
David W. Cromwell, Yorba Linda.

COLORADO

Vincent J. Federico, Aguilar.
James D. White, Boulder.
Daniel J. Thyne, Cheyenne Wells.
Dallas D. Hopkins, Fleming.
Harold D. Haskins, Georgetown.
Richard A. Clifton, Mount Harris.
Glen E. McCall, Norwood.
Richard I. DeVore, Pagosa Springs.
Audrey M. Ashworth, Strasburg.
Delbert P. Hankins, Jr., Walden.
James J. Tesitor, Walsenburg.

CONNECTICUT

John L. Sullivan, Ridgefield.

FLORIDA

Leona M. French, Flagler Beach.
Hugh C. MacGibbon, Punta Gorda.
Margaret H. Reintjes, Rattlesnake.

GEORGIA

Thomas Randall Bryan, Jr., Brooklet.
Alfred I. Young, Columbus.
Robert L. Lord, Toombsboro.

IDAHO

John W. Hickman, Genesee.
Clark G. Wylie, Melba.
Ethel M. Snyder, Welpee.

ILLINOIS

John E. Duhigg, Davis Junction.
John V. Barnes, Patoka.
Seth W. Lane, Piper City.
Emmett J. Stromberg, Westmont.

INDIANA

Paul R. Cole, Cortland.
James C. Dunn, Fairmount.
Archie E. Lighty, Jr., Hillsboro.
Marion A. Sendmeyer, Poland.
Robert L. Lemon, Reynolds.
Charles E. Fay, Waynetown.
Gilbert G. Souder, Woodburn.

IOWA

Wilfrid T. McDermott, Cascade.
James A. Erpelding, Dike.
Leonard W. Brock, Grinnell.
John V. Conway, Le Mars.
Paul M. Flynn, Ute.
Mary A. Slattery, Waterville.

KANSAS

Wilbur E. Sherbondy, Alton.
Jack E. Hardesty, Ashland.
Vida K. Wise, Conway Springs.
John J. Lawson, Tribune.
John H. Edds, Whiting.

KENTUCKY

Perry R. Brown, Mayfield.

LOUISIANA

Frank Cazanove, Hammond.
Frank E. Foreman, Iowa.
William B. Nash, Lake Charles.
Irvin J. Dufour, Moreauville.
Roy J. Belanger, Morgan City.

MAINE

Ashton M. Mabee, Eastport.
Ruth E. Houghton, North Anson.
Fred C. Stafford, Pittsfield.

MICHIGAN

Nelson F. Kramer, Akron.
Charles Keck, Jr., Ashley.
James J. Wilder, Clawson.
Stanley R. Schlieve, Fruitport.
Roland F. Stoffer, Gregory.
Lloyd G. Smith, Linden.
Arthur G. Rochon, Marine City.
Harry B. Whitson, Traverse City.

MINNESOTA

Martin H. Lindeman, Brownton.
Robert P. Heesen, Osseo.

MISSOURI

James E. O'Connell, Barnard.
Ida K. Look, Kidder.
Albert W. Jeffries, Odessa.
Maurice F. Hogan, Sedalia.

MISSISSIPPI

Marie E. West, Carriere.
Richard T. Prince, Mize.

NEBRASKA

Gerald E. Beltz, Brunswick.
Mildred J. Rounds, Cairo.
Melvin F. Jacoby, Spencer.
Daisy G. Holliday, Stuart.

NEW JERSEY

Sadie M. Chester, Adelphia.
Frances B. Engelsen, Barnegat Light.
Emanuel E. McBride, Berlin.
George J. Holbig, Blawenburg.
Margaret H. Ardin, Chester.
Warren K. Lehr, Columbia.
William Frank Carling, Gibbsboro.
Edward J. Wojcik, Great Meadows.
Harold J. Sadlock, Paramus.
John V. R. Nichol, Pompton Lakes.
Wilmer Johnson, Jr., Seaside Park.
Myrtle J. Stretch, Somers Point.

NEW YORK

Bruce M. Austin, Attica.
Margaret A. Kneuer, Industry.
Jack J. Powers, Montgomery.
Rita H. Wells, Schaghticoke.

NORTH CAROLINA

James B. Darden, Clinton.
John K. Reeves, Hot Springs.
Robert T. Simmons, Roseboro.
Fred J. Baars, Warsaw.

OHIO

Walter E. Boyle, Brecksville.
Joseph H. Frecker, Crooksville.
Cora E. Hesselbart, Lindsey.
Robert E. Lucas, Wauseon.

OKLAHOMA

Florence O. Scott, Delaware.
Vera C. Dittelmier, Mulhall.
Pauline Wallace, Wayne.

OREGON

Eugene D. Wilmoth, Cove.
Roy Bugh, Wecoma Beach.

PENNSYLVANIA

Paul F. Petrillo, Birdsboro.
William P. Kelly, Jr., Clarks Summit.
Henry C. Johnston, Smithton.
Anthony N. Ricchezza, Upper Darby.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Edgar G. DesChamps, Jr., Bishopville.
William K. Williams, Honea Path.
Thomas J. King, Johns Island.

TENNESSEE

Paul T. Meadows, Henderson.
Burleigh L. Day, Pressmen's Home.

TEXAS

Billy B. Vest, Alpine.
James B. Thorn, Jr., Alto.
Iris H. Davis, Clarkwood.
Pat R. Warren, Coleman.
William E. Simpson, Graham.
Andrew T. Davenport, Howe.
Billy O. Jones, Kosse.
Randell L. Barberee, Maud.
Jesse L. Gandy, Meridian.
Ora C. Littleton, Moore.
Mildred L. M. Smith, Round Top.
Glenn S. Feemster, Vera.
Cloy L. Allen, Wingate.

UTAH

Mack C. Crandall, St. George.

VERMONT

James H. McKinnon, Brattleboro.
Irene M. Barrett, Milton.

VIRGINIA

Elmer L. Johnson, Charlottesville.
Margie L. Nicewander, Harman.
Aubrey J. Short, Hurt.
Charles E. Ivey, Jarratt.
John R. Diedrich, Leesburg.
Frank G. Farrier, Newport.
William O. Brittingham, Onley.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ulric W. Grimes, East Rainelle.
Marguerite V. Duncan, Eleanor.
Gladys L. St. Clair, Elkhorn.
William B. Hammond, Kearneysville.
Ralph M. Johnson, Millville.

WISCONSIN

Harry Gelb, White Lake.

WYOMING

Steve A. Grobon, Rock Springs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou merciful and omnipotent God, whose loving kindness and beneficent purposes are always directed toward our welfare and happiness, we pray that we may be more eager to accept and respond to Thy gracious overtures.

We penitently and humbly confess that in these days of misgiving and surrounding darkness our self-willed and rebellious hearts are being softened and made suppliant for we are becoming increasingly aware of our weakness and helplessness and our desperate need of Thee.

We beseech Thee that the time may speedily come when men and nations everywhere shall allow their minds to be guided by the counsels of Thy holy word and all mankind shall seek to incarnate the ideals of our blessed Lord.

Inspire us to give ourselves earnestly and resolutely to the great task of establishing Thy kingdom of righteousness and peace upon this earth.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced

that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1517. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement national forest timber in amounts not exceeding \$2,000 in appraised value.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT WEST POINT

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD the address of the President of the United States delivered at West Point on May 20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point a speech made by the President of the United States on the occasion of the sesquicentennial convocation at the United States Military Academy in West Point, Tuesday, May 20, 1952, as appearing in the New York Times on Wednesday, May 21, 1952:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS AT WEST POINT'S CONVOCATION

Following is the text of President Truman's address yesterday at the sesquicentennial convocation at the United States Military Academy in West Point as recorded by the New York Times:

"General Irving. General Bradley. Dr. Compton, honorable Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and distinguished guests, I want to make a statement, just two short statements, before I start my regular talk. I had a luncheon at noon with nine cadets and I want to say to them—and I am saying it very publicly—that I haven't had a more pleasant luncheon in many a day. I appreciated it very much.

"I have another statement to make. You know the President has several positions in which he works. He's President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States; he's the social head of the state and he's head of the party; and I'm going to work in two of those capacities right this minute.

"As President of the United States under the Constitution, the President has power to pardon anybody for anything but impeachment. Of course he couldn't pardon himself. So exercising my authority as President of the United States under the Constitution, I direct the Commandant of West Point to relieve all this special punishment that's going on on the post today. And as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States I direct General Irving to carry out that order."

A STORY ABOUT BARKLEY

"Now you know I'm in sort of a position Senator BARKLEY found himself in one time, and I want this to be distinctly understood that I enjoyed immensely the two speeches that were made before me. They were wonderful. I hope I can make half the contribution that either one of those wonderful men made.

"But Senator BARKLEY was the last on the program and Senator BARKLEY likes to speak. And he took his watch out and put it on the stand and he spoke for about an hour and he looked at his watch, then picked it up and put it to his ear and shook it. And

some old gentleman out in the audience said:

"'Senator, if it's stopped there's a calendar behind you.'

"'But you're not going to need a calendar because this is not that long and I hope that it won't be as bothersome as you may anticipate it will be.

"'But, it is a real pleasure for me to be here today, and to join in celebrating the establishment of the United States Military Academy at West Point 150 years ago.

"'This academy was started during Thomas Jefferson's first term as President. The United States at that time was relatively small and weak, and surrounded by dangers. We had just fought a limited and undeclared war with France to protect the freedom of our commerce and shipping. We were engaged in fighting another limited and undeclared war with the Barbary pirates for the same purpose.'

CONTINUING PROBLEM SEEN

"'Jefferson, like Washington and Hamilton and other leaders of our young Republic, knew very well that a strong military establishment was vital to the preservation of American liberty. And these patriot leaders knew also that you cannot have effective military forces unless you have well trained, well prepared officers.

"'They all knew how Washington had to struggle and experiment all through the Revolution to find officers who could take troops into battle and lead them to victory. That was why they wanted a military academy, as an essential part of a strong, permanent, national defense organization.

"'But there was a great deal of opposition to starting a military academy in this country. It took 20 years of argument and persuasion after the Revolution was over before the academy could be started. And it was finally started largely because Jefferson took the position that if the Congress didn't authorize a military academy, he'd start one himself.

"'The argument over establishing a military academy was part and parcel of the argument over whether the United States should have strong national defenses. That argument has continued, of course, right down to the present day, and much of the debate after the Revolution is very modern. They are making those same old arguments today just as they made about the Military Academy when Jefferson was trying to start it.

"'There were a lot of people in this country in 1800 who were afraid that setting up a military academy and an Army and Navy would make us belligerent and warlike. You can hear echoes of that point of view today in the debate over universal military training.

"'There were a lot of other people in 1800 who said that a strong national defense would cost too much, and you could not have a formula for achieving security without having to pay for it. That point of view is not only echoed today—it's loudly shouted in the newspapers and the Halls of Congress.'

PREPAREDNESS IS URGED

"'Fortunately, these arguments did not prevail against the hard-headed common sense of men like Jefferson. The military academy was set up; and this country has had occasion to be thankful many times since then that our early leaders had so much foresight.

"'The Military Academy has repaid this country many times over for every cent it has cost. We have learned from experience that, while it may be expensive to maintain a strong national defense, it is much more expensive not to have one. Time and again we have allowed our Armed Forces to dwindle to a fraction of what they should have been, and then we have had to pay enormously—in money and in lives—because of our lack of preparedness.

"'There are people right now who want us to relax and cut down on our defense program.

They are just as wrong as they can be. We must pay the cost of preventing a world war—or we will surely have to pay the immensely greater cost of fighting one.

"'The other fear of the early opponents of the Military Academy has also proved groundless. Our country has never become warlike or aggressive.

"'That is partly because our Constitution nailed down so firmly the principle of civilian control over the military. The most important means by which this was done was by providing in the Constitution that the President, who is the civilian head of the Government elected by the people, shall be Commander in Chief of all the military forces. Many Presidents, including the present one, have demonstrated that those words in the Constitution mean just what they say.

"'But, in addition to this, the spirit of our people has never been warlike. Our people came to this country to find peace and freedom. That's what we have always wanted. That's what we want now, and that is what our national policy is designed to preserve.'

PEACEFUL BUT NOT PASSIVE

"'But there is a vast difference between being peaceful and being passive. We want to achieve peace. But we know we can't have it unless we are willing to stand up for our rights.

"'We know we can't have lasting peace unless we work actively and vigorously to bring about conditions of freedom and justice in the world. That is what we are trying to do. And we are having to do it in the face of a concerted campaign of threats and sabotage and outright aggression directed by the Soviet Union.

"'The policies of the Soviet Union are exactly the opposite of our own. We want to establish equality and justice and the rule of law among all nations. They want to establish domination and dictatorship and the rule of force over all countries. This makes our situation—the situation of all free nations—difficult and dangerous in the extreme. But I am firmly convinced that it does not necessarily mean a third world war.

"'The free countries can, by proper and adequate defense measures, make clear to the Kremlin that aggression would be doomed to failure.

"'And the free nations can, by economic and political means, build up their strength so as to be safe from Communist infiltration and subversion.

"'But strong and active as we may be, we cannot avoid the risks and sacrifices. They are inherent in the situation and we cannot wish them out of existence. The course of events is not completely in our control.'

COURSE IN KOREA CITED

"'In Korea we had no choice but to meet armed aggression with military force. If we had not met aggression head-on, the United Nations Charter would have been reduced to a scrap of paper. If Communist aggression had been allowed to succeed in Korea, the Communist conquest of all Asia would have been simply a matter of time. If the United Nations had failed, and Asia had fallen, we would have been well on the way to a disintegration of freedom in the whole world.

"'But that did not happen. The valor and sacrifices of United States fighting men—together with the forces of the Republic of Korea and the contingents from 15 other countries—has beaten the aggressors back within their own territory. Our Army, led in large part by men trained here at West Point, has done a superb job.

"'From the time our men were first sent into action, in the gallant rear-guard defense down to the Pusan perimeter—from then right on up to the present, the United States Army in Korea has been magnificent.

"'And the men who have fought with them, in the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine

Corps, and from the armed forces of the other free countries, have been just as brave and just as effective.

"Last June, 11 months ago, the badly battered Communists offered to confer about a military armistice in Korea. We were willing to conclude such an armistice, and we still are. We don't want any more fighting than is necessary. But we were not interested, and we are not interested now, in any armistice that involves selling out the principles for which we are fighting.

"Patiently and skillfully, General Ridgway and his negotiating team, headed by Admiral Joy, have worked to bring about an effective armistice. They have done a masterful job in the face of great provocation. They have met threats, and abuse, and outright lies, all with great self-control and an unyielding insistence on the essentials of a just and honorable armistice."

ARMISTICE POINTS LISTED

"Gradually, the Communists have come to realize that we will not sacrifice our principles to obtain an armistice. We do not know whether they will finally agree on an honest and workable armistice. So far, they have agreed to some of the points that must be covered.

"They have agreed that the armistice line across Korea should be a defensible military line determined by the location of the opposing forces. They have agreed that no reinforcements shall be brought into Korea by either side during the armistice. They have agreed that an inspection commission shall observe the carrying out of the armistice terms—and are apparently willing to withdraw the request that the Soviet Union should be one of the neutral inspecting nations.

"Up to now, however, the Communists have not agreed on a fair and proper exchange of prisoners of war. The Communists have continued to insist that all the prisoners we have taken must be handed over to them—regardless of whether or not they are willing to be sent back behind the iron curtain, and regardless of what their fate would be if they were sent back.

"It is perfectly clear that thousands and thousands of the prisoners we hold would violently resist being returned to the Communists because they fear the slavery or death which would await them. It would be a betrayal of the ideals of freedom and justice for which we are fighting if we forced these men at bayonet point to return to their ex-masters. We won't do it. We won't buy an armistice by trafficking in human slavery.

"We do not know whether the Communists will accept that position. We may not know for some time yet. Negotiations are continuing under General Clark's direction. We shall remain ready to reach honorable settlements by peaceful gains. But we must also be alert and ready to meet treachery or a renewal of aggression if that should come."

THE RED BUILD-UP

"During these months of armistice negotiations in Korea, the Communists have increased their military strength. They have more men there than they had a year ago, and many more tanks and planes.

"But we have consolidated and increased our strength in Korea also. The morale of our men is high, and our units are well trained, well equipped, and at a peak of combat efficiency. The troops of the Republic of Korea are far better trained and equipped than they were a year ago, and are capable of carrying a much larger share of the defense of their country.

"The situation in Korea is still difficult and uncertain. Everybody should understand that. But everyone should also understand that the sacrifices of the United Nations in Korea have brought tremendous gains toward a world of law and order.

"The plain fact is that the Communists have utterly failed in their objectives in Korea.

"The Communist aggression failed to shatter the United Nations. Instead, the Communist attack has made the United Nations stronger and more vigorous and has demonstrated that it can and will act to defend freedom in the world.

"The Communists failed to win a cheap and easy victory in Korea. Instead, they have suffered more than a million casualties, and have used up enormous amounts of war material—and they are back behind the line where they started.

"The Communists failed to establish tyranny over the Republic of Korea. Instead, the Communist aggression has brought devastation to North Korea—a terrible warning to the other satellites in the Soviet empire of the cost of aggression."

WORLD EFFECTS RECITED

"Furthermore, the Communists failed to break the will of free men in other countries. The attack on Korea was supposed to warn other countries that they must yield to the demands of the Kremlin—or else.

"The Communist aggression did show the world that the Kremlin was ready and willing to try to extend its power by military conquest. But the effect of this was not to send the free countries into a panic of fear. Instead, they immediately stepped up their plans for building military forces, and began to get together on concrete and definite defense arrangements.

"As a result of the resistance to Communist aggression in Korea, the Kremlin knows that free men will stand up and fight against aggression. As a result of the resistance to Communist aggression in Korea, free men around the world know that if they stand up for what is right, they will not be deserted by the United Nations. And, as a result of the resistance to Communist aggression in Korea, the free countries are infinitely better prepared to defend themselves than they were 2 years ago.

"Our own defense production has risen very sharply. Our production of military supplies and equipment is more than three times what it was a year ago. For example, in January 1952, six times the dollar value of ammunition was delivered as was delivered in January 1951. In electronics and communication equipment, five times as much was delivered.

"The production of one of our most important fighter planes was four times as much this spring as it was last. We now have several thousand tanks of a new model which is very much better than the previous models. Our Navy has taken hundreds of ships out of mothballs and has a sound shipbuilding program under way."

ATOMIC THREAT MADE

"An atomic artillery piece has been developed and tested and will have to be reckoned with in the future. The Navy is working on its first atomic-powered submarine. Our over-all atomic production program is in excellent shape.

"In all the vast and complicated field of combat vehicles and military weapons, the research and preparation of the last several years are paying off. The goods are being delivered to the hands of men who are ready to use them in defense of freedom—both in our own forces and among the many trusted friends that we have all over the world.

"The improvement in defense production is not the only indication of an improved situation in the world.

"In the Far East, Japan has rejoined the family of free and democratic nations. The Communist insurrection in the Philippines has been brought under control. In Indochina the forces of France and the associ-

ated states have succeeded in holding the Communists in check. The people of Indochina are making progress in the creation of national armies to defend their own independence. Countries like India and Pakistan and Indonesia are making real headway in creating the conditions of economic growth that must underlie solid and stable progress.

"In Europe great steps toward unity are being taken. The Schuman plan and the plans for the European Defense Community are moving forward. We are working to reach final agreement on a new relationship with the Federal Republic of Germany. This will make it possible for Germany to take her place alongside the other independent countries of Europe as a full and equal member of the community of nations.

"These are very remarkable developments. Countries like France, Germany, and Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg, with centuries of rivalry between them, are now starting to work together. They are developing common economic and political institutions; they are merging their military forces into one great defensive system.

"No wonder the Soviets are trying to block this advance. No wonder the current Communist propaganda line is trying to persuade the countries of Western Europe that they should stay separate and weak, instead of joining together for strength. The Kremlin knows as well as anyone else that in union there is strength—and that a united Europe can frustrate the Kremlin's dearest wish of absorbing the European countries one by one into the Soviet empire.

"I don't think the people of Europe are going to be fooled by this Soviet propaganda. I believe the firm and concrete steps the Europeans have already taken over the opposition of the Kremlin, are clear indications that they are not going to be stopped. I think the Europeans are going to continue to move toward closer union—for they know that is the way of strength and progress for them and for the whole free world."

PLEDGES NO RELAXATION

"I have been speaking of the progress that is being made. But I don't want anyone to get the impression that there is any basis for relaxing or letting up. These signs of progress are not evidence that the battle for freedom is won—only that we are on the way to winning it. If we halt or falter now, we could ruin the whole structure of peace and freedom we have been so painfully building.

"I have warned the Congress on several occasions that the financial support I have requested for our defense effort and for the mutual security program is absolutely necessary. Any cuts in those items would have extremely serious effects. No one enjoys bearing the heavy costs of national security in these dangerous times, but we should never forget how much smaller they are than the costs of another war.

"No one should assume that the possibility of world war has become remote. The forces of the Soviet Empire are large, well trained, and equipped with modern weapons. The Kremlin's desire to dominate the world is obviously unchanged.

"But I believe we are well on the way to preserving our freedom without paying the frightful cost of world war. We are on the right track. And we must go ahead.

"If we are to succeed, we must have steady nerves and stout hearts. There is no easy way out, no quick solution. But we have with us the overwhelming support of the free countries and the powerful moral forces of liberty and justice. We are using the strength God has given us in this great and wonderful Nation to win the struggle for peace and freedom throughout the world.

"You young men here at West Point are called on to play a great part in the tremendous effort we are making. You are

being trained for a career which, in these times especially, means service for the great good for your Nation and the welfare of all mankind. Your opportunities are great because the task ahead of you is great.

"We need—all of us—to draw on the wonderful tradition of resolution and courage which has been cherished for 150 years in the life of the cadets here at West Point."

CHEESE POLICY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1951, restricting imports of cheese, seems to me to be the perfect illustration of taking away with the one hand what we have given with the other. This country has tried to help Western Europe to become self-supporting. It has urged Western Europe to increase its exports so that it will be able to earn the dollars it needs for its existence. We have invested a great deal of money and a great deal of effort in this venture.

But as soon as Western Europe responds to these efforts, as soon as it develops the industries and the exports it needs to sustain itself, we systematically develop new trade barriers to make sure that these products will not be sold and that the dollars Western Europe needs will not be earned.

Section 104 makes no sense in terms of our major foreign-policy objectives.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McINTIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, on the subject of the potato situation.

REORGANIZED INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE IN ILLINOIS

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I am holding in my hand an invitation that recently arrived in my office. It reads:

The Secretary of the Treasury requests the pleasure of the company of Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON at installation ceremonies for officials of the reorganized internal-revenue service in Illinois, Tuesday, May 20, 1952, United States courthouse, Chicago, Ill., 10:30 a. m.

Like every other Congressman, I receive some invitations to affairs of one kind or another, but this is one of the fanciest in a long time. I run a small daily newspaper out in Paris, Ill., and I know something about printing, but I must concede this is the kind of job we just do not see frequently out in my part of the country.

I took this invitation to a commercial printing firm here in Washington, and they told me it is indeed a very plush job. The first thing that meets the eye is this large gold seal embossed on the upper part of the card. Then there are seven lines of handsome engraving. The card itself is of heavy stock in a vellum finish, and the envelope is made of high-grade 28-pound paper.

I am informed the cost of producing these invitations is at least 30 cents each. In addition, there is the cost of addressing them by hand and of delivering them by messenger.

I want to remind you that the ceremonies referred to in the invitation mark the start of the so-called reorganized internal-revenue service in Illinois. If this invitation is any indication—and it may be—of how this supposedly new internal-revenue service is going to operate, then it appears the Treasury is going on the gold standard, at least in the spending for its social affairs. I do hope, though, that the Treasury will give some thought to economizing before all the gold in Fort Knox and the taxpayers' patience are exhausted.

RESIGNATION FROM MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a commission:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1952.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, effective at once.

Respectfully submitted.

WALTER E. BREHM,
Eleventh, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission to fill the existing vacancy thereon the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on tomorrow, May 22, 1952, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 80]

Aandahl	Granger	O'Toole
Albert	Green	Patterson
Armstrong	Harden	Phillips
Bailey	Havener	Potter
Beckworth	Hays, Ohio	Poulson
Boykin	Herlong	Powell
Bramblett	Hoeven	Sabath
Brownson	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Buffett	Hollfield	Scudder
Burton	Hunter	Secrest
Camp	Irving	Shelley
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Sheppard
Carlyle	Jarman	Sieminski
Celler	Javits	Steed
Chatham	Johnson	Stockman
Chudoff	Kennedy	Tackett
Cooley	Kerr	Taylor
Corbett	King, Calif.	Teague
Coudert	King, Pa.	Van Pelt
Cunningham	McConnell	Vinson
Dawson	McGrath	Welch
Deane	McKinnon	Werdel
D'Ewart	Mansfield	Wheeler
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Doyle	Mitchell	Williams, Miss.
Durham	Morris	Wilson, Ind.
Engle	Moulder	
Gavin	Multer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 344 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have permission to sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair

appoints as members of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1953, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. McCORMACK, and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7005, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is entitled to recognition for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is entitled to recognition for 3 hours.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in these difficult and dangerous times when all our problems seem to be infinitely complex it is worth while to try to cut through these complexities and get down to simple fundamentals whenever we can. I, therefore, ask the Members of the House to consider with me some very simple, almost elementary, questions which we cannot and must not ignore as we determine how we shall act on this important legislation.

The first question we must ask ourselves is this: Is our security—our national survival—our way of life—and all the things we hold dear threatened today? I doubt that there is a single Member of the House who would not answer this question with a positive "yes."

The next question, equally simple and fundamental, is this: Do we meet this threat, or do we stand by supinely waiting for the blow to fall upon us? Obviously, no red-blooded American can hesitate for a moment in giving his answer to this question. It is not in our tradition to turn tail and run when we are threatened. It is needless to point out to you that the actions of the Congress itself since 1948 in appropriating to our own defense establishment the staggering sum of \$136,363,000,000 prove beyond any question that we have recognized the mortal threat to our national security and decided to meet it head on.

The third question is: Do we realize that this fight for freedom, if successful, must be waged on all the fronts of the world, and that we need armed friends by our side? The answer by the Congress has been unmistakably "yes." How otherwise do you interpret the passage of the Marshall plan in 1948 by a Republican Congress, and the subsequent overwhelming bipartisan support for

many billions of dollars in annual appropriations for building up the strength of our allies? If what I am saying is not true, why did we plan and carry through the North Atlantic Treaty, band together with the nations of Western Europe, pledge ourselves to regard an attack on any one of them as an attack on ourselves, and vote more billions each year to help them build up their military strength to resist aggression? Why did the Senate approve the North Atlantic Treaty with only a handful of dissenting votes? Why are we sacrificing the precious lives of our boys in Korea and spending billions of dollars fighting Soviet aggression over there if there is no threat? There has been and there is a mortal threat and we have recognized it and decided, true to our traditions, to meet it here and abroad and not bow down before it. Through this fiscal year, including past appropriations for the Marshall plan, China aid, and the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, we have made available for the purpose of promoting our defense through strengthening our allies a total of \$26,000,000,000. If there has been no danger, why have we done all this? If that danger still persists, the only question is: Are we going to quit now? I have no doubt as to the answer of the Congress and the American people.

With these fundamentals agreed on, the decision before us can be stated simply and clearly. That decision is what is the best way to continue to meet the threat adequately and at the least cost in American men and money.

There may be some here still who honestly feel that we should retire within the boundaries of the United States and build up a fortress here instead of using the resources and manpower of other like-minded people in the world who are ready and eager to join us in the struggle for peace and freedom. That is pure defeatism, for without allies we could not have any real security. In addition, if we could have security that way, it would cost a lot more. If all the resources and manpower of the rest of the world were organized against us, we would be forced to read the handwriting on the wall. Without the essential raw materials which we must have from other areas of the world, it would be impossible, with any amount of money, for us to build an adequate defense.

In this era of advanced technology, no single area of the world can hope to be self-sufficient in producing defensive equipment, or even many of the essential components of our civilian economy.

Electronic equipment, jet engines, radar, as well as the older and more conventional types of military items, together with a vast range of items for civilian consumption, require materials which we must obtain from many different parts of the world.

A thought-provoking report by General Collins, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, shows that each new medium tank requires 1,915 pounds of chromium, of which 99 percent is imported; 950 pounds of manganese, of which 92 percent is imported; 520 pounds of nickel, of which 92 percent is imported; 100 pounds of tin, of which 78 percent is

imported; 6,512 pounds of bauxite, of which 65 percent is imported; 1,484 pounds of copper, of which 29 percent is imported.

Actually, the degree of our dependency on outside sources for essential materials is even more serious than indicated by General Collins' report. The General based his figures on utilization of scrap materials, presently available here, but which originally had to be imported and still must be.

For example, we must import 99 percent instead of 92 percent of the nickel to make a tank, 42 percent instead of 29 percent of copper, and 100 percent of the tin instead of 78 percent. We produce absolutely no tin in the United States. We are completely dependent for our supply of this most essential metal upon sources in Malaya and Africa, with a part of our requirements available in South America.

I think most of our thinking people fully realize the gravity of our situation. They know that we must meet this threat now, at home and abroad. It is not just a coincidence that, so far, every candidate for the Presidency this year has endorsed the principle of foreign aid and mutual security. Even Mr. TAFT has said that the Mutual Security Program must not be killed and abandoned. Even when he says he wants to cut it substantially below the figure proposed by the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House, he quickly explains that he is sure it will not ruin the program. He would not propose it, he says, if he thought it would ruin the program.

Let's see where we stand then on these basic questions I have asked.

We all agree that there is a threat and a continuing threat to our national survival.

We all agree that we are going to meet this threat.

We agree, at least the overwhelming majority of us, that we are going to meet it with a "Mutual Security Program" and not with a "fortress America program."

The question we should concentrate on, therefore, is what kind of a Mutual Security Program we want. Let us not waste time talking about whether we want one or not.

I think we can all agree also that it would be useless and a waste of money to have an inadequate program.

I think we can also agree on the fact that we want our program to cost as little as possible, both in men and money, and still remain adequate.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has spent about 2 months of intensive work on trying to determine what will be an adequate mutual security program and how best to achieve the maximum results with the least cost. The committee, after this careful examination, determined that the greatest amount that could safely be cut from the administration request was about \$1,000,000,000. I know there are Members of this House who propose to cut much more deeply than this. I say to you that I would not wish to take the responsibility of going beyond this figure because that responsibility involves the national survival of our country.

With all my deep concern for the financial position of this country and realizing as I do that if the United States is bankrupted the cause of freedom in the world will be lost, I know that the cause of economy never has had and never will have a greater appeal to the citizens of this country than the cause of national defense and national survival.

I say to you flatly that the man in this House who votes to cut deeply the amount brought before you by the Foreign Affairs Committee, whatever may be his reasons or his motives, is voting to leave a gap in our security defense line.

He may be voting to throw away the one best chance of avoiding World War III, because only as we are collectively strong can we be confident that Soviet imperialism will not attack us.

He is voting to weaken, and possibly to destroy, the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance.

He is voting to take the risk of turning over to Russia the second-largest workshop of the world. This workshop next year will raise and support about 4,000,000 soldiers and produce \$3,500,000,000 worth of weapons.

He is voting to increase the cost of our own defense manifold because if Western Europe were lost, we would need a huge increase in our own Army, Navy, and Air Force to have any chance of meeting Russia on equal terms if trouble should start. He is, therefore, not really voting for economy but, unless he is satisfied to leave us much more defenseless, he is voting for greatly increased expenditures.

He is voting to place more of our young men than necessary in the front line of defense against the threatened aggression of Russia because he is voting to take out of that front line the strong and stanch allies who would fight with us in case of trouble.

He is voting to take the risk that, if World War III comes, the fighting would take place right in our own country instead of many thousands of miles away.

I have enough confidence in the common sense of the American people to know that they will not approve action by this House which will have the effect of breaking down our defenses at home or abroad.

First, let us see what progress has been made by our associates in the military field. Let us cast our minds back to the situation in 1948, when the Marshall plan was launched, or even as recently as mid-1950 when the Communists attacked in Korea. You will remember that then there was literally almost nothing to stop the Red armies if they had marched across Europe. Even our atomic power, the one great military resource of the free world, was hampered by lack of bases. Since that time new divisions have been raised, trained, and equipped, and have taken up positions alongside our own in threatened areas of Europe. Constriction periods in Europe have been lengthened, military budgets more than doubled, military production increased. As a result there is now a substantial force in being. As General Gruenther said, in contrast with a year ago, "we

are now dealing with actual forces and not planned forces alone." In addition, our strategic air power, which remains so important an element in the military balance, has acquired a much more satisfactory system of bases through the help and cooperation of the allies whose military strength we are helping to build through this program. Where once there were only scattered, ineffectual national forces, there is now integrated command. It seems to me that only the most stubborn defeatist could fail to be immensely encouraged by the increase and improvement in allied military strength over two short years.

Active forces which stood at 1,407,000 in January 1950 reached the figure of 1,880,000 in January 1952. The figures for January 1953 are classified for obvious reasons, but I can say they represent a very substantial increase over this year's active forces. I should emphasize also that these figures are for active forces. Additional reserves readily mobilizable have also increased greatly over the past 2 years. The amount of increase in this category is also classified. The period of compulsory military service has been increased on the average by 6 months. Defense budgets have been raised from about 6 billion in 1950 to approximately 11½ billion in 1952 and an estimated 14 billion in 1953.

Before going into the details of the bill before you, may I call to your attention some good work done by the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Congress last year.

The Congress wrote into the Mutual Security Act of 1951 provision for bringing the defense program under the unified direction and supervision of a single person in the Executive Office of the President. The Director for Mutual Security was given two jobs: First, to coordinate and supervise the work of the Departments of State and Defense and the Mutual Security Agency on the Mutual Security Program; and, second, to head one of those agencies—the Mutual Security Agency.

Mr. Averell Harriman was appointed Director for Mutual Security. Mr. Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., Assistant Director and Chief of Staff, is Mr. Harriman's principal assistant in the job of directing and supervising the Mutual Security Program as a whole, and acts for him when he is absent. Mr. John W. Kenney serves as Deputy Director for Mutual Security and is in active charge, under Mr. Harriman of the Mutual Security Agency.

Three principal people work with Mr. Harriman and Mr. Tannenwald in the over-all coordinating job, Mr. Lincoln Gordon, Mr. John H. Ohly and Mr. Richard N. Johnson, Mr. Tannenwald and the Director's coordinating staff have no more and no less to do with the Mutual Security Agency than they do with the Department of State and the Department of Defense. Their job is to help the Director be sure that the assistance programs are developed and carried out so as to be mutually supporting, consistent both with each other and with national objectives.

Actual operations are decentralized, with the Director supervising and directing the over-all program. Actual operations of the military assistance program are carried out by the Department of Defense, where the military end items are bought and shipped. Likewise, the point 4 program of the Technical Cooperation Administration is developed and carried out in the State Department.

Mr. C. Tyler Wood is the Associate Deputy Director. Before Mr. Kenney's appointment he was in interim charge of MSA and is now on special duty, coordinating and presenting the programs to the Congress.

Ambassador William H. Draper, Jr., has been appointed special representative in Europe and is responsible for the program in Europe. He is also the United States permanent representative on the North Atlantic Treaty Council. In these two jobs he represents Secretary Acheson, Secretary Lovett, and Mr. Harriman on Mutual Security Program and NATO matters.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN BILL MADE BY COMMITTEE

Now we come to the bill before us. The thorough study of H. R. 7005 made by the committee is reflected in the more than 20 amendments made in the text of the bill as reported. To simplify consideration, the committee amendments were consolidated into one new text, so I wish to enumerate the principal ones for the information of the House. They are:

Section 2: Adopted Senate language of section 2 which authorizes assistance to three designated organizations for unifying Europe rather than to any such organization as provided in H. R. 7005 as introduced.

Section 3: Amended Mutual Security Act to mention Spain by name as eligible to receive assistance—was eligible previously.

Cut military authorization by 20 percent from \$4,145,000,000 to \$3,316,000,000 and authorized carry-over of unobligated rather than unexpended funds. This latter change was made in all authorizations of funds.

Cut defense support 10 percent from \$1,819,200,000 to \$1,637,300,000.

Retained the authority to transfer 10 percent within title I rather than the 5 percent proposed in H. R. 7005.

Earmarked not less than \$25,000,000 for Spain.

Section 4: No alteration of amounts in title II—Near East and Africa—but adopted the Senate form of authorization by specifying the funds for Arab refugees and for refugees coming to Israel and for technical assistance in that area.

Section 5: Struck out exemption of title III funds from section 503 of MSA. This means that TCA will have to take over from MSA the programs in Burma and Indonesia.

Section 6: Redesignated area as American Republics and non-self-governing territories of the Western Hemisphere.

Section 7: Provided that no part of the United States contribution to the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants

from Europe could be used to pay salary or expenses of the Director General of such committee if a former employee of UNRRA or IRO.

MSA Act amended to authorize distribution of 50 supergrades already provided among all departments and agencies covered in the program. Some of these may be assigned to point 4, State and Defense.

Required a 10-percent reduction—based on January 1, 1952, personnel—of personnel other than blue-collar workers and technical consultants.

Director for Mutual Security required to reduce reporting requirements.

Authorized the transfer of not more than \$1,000,000,000 of military items from United States defense program to foreign nations in addition to equipment authorized by this bill.

Required that no less than \$1,000,000,000 be earmarked exclusively for offshore procurement.

Authorized total expenditure of not more than \$100,000,000, not more than \$20,000,000 to any country, without conditions as to eligibility. This would permit giving limited assistance to nations which we wish to help but which may be afraid to enter into agreements with us.

Authorized Director for Mutual Security to develop strategic materials in world deficiency for countries receiving United States assistance.

The Director for Mutual Security required to take suitable and appropriate steps to assure effective use by recipient countries of their own resources for mutual security.

Provided up to \$100,000,000 of counterpart to encourage free enterprise.

Permitted up to \$100,000,000 of military production and economic and technical assistance funds to be used for subscribing to capital of an International Finance Corporation.

Investment and informational media guaranties continued after June 30, 1952, to all areas where United States assistance is granted.

Required Mutual Security Agency to develop broad criteria for guaranties and to conduct study of impediments to private investment abroad; Department of State required to accelerate commercial and tax-treaty program; Technical Cooperation Administration required to encourage and facilitate greater participation by industrial groups in point 4 programs and to bring investment opportunities in underdeveloped areas to attention of private enterprise.

Section 9: Required counterpart funds used for loans by recipient countries to be redeposited in counterpart special account when loans are repaid so as to give the United States continuing participation in their administration.

Assured that total counterpart fund be available for strategic materials without regard to 5-percent limitation.

Section 11: Authorized \$12,000,000 for UNICEF for period ending December 31, 1953, on condition that United States contribution not exceed one-third of contribution from all governments. None of the activities for which these funds are authorized shall duplicate any of the activities of other U. N. agencies.

UNOBLIGATED AND UNEXPENDED BALANCES

A great deal will be said around here today about unobligated and unexpended balances. Let us get the record straight.

As amended by the committee, the bill authorizes a total of \$6,901,100,000 in new funds. This is a reduction of \$998,900,000 from the \$7,900,000,000 requested by the Executive for the fiscal 1953 requirements of the Mutual Security Program.

There has been some misunderstanding about the exact fiscal status of the program. This is only natural in view of its complexity and size. The simplest and most accurate view can be obtained by looking at the entire picture. Like the separate parts of a jigsaw puzzle, the picture clears when the sections are put together.

Starting with the Marshall plan funds and the subsequent related acts from the Eightieth Congress to the present, cumulative funds made available through fiscal 1952 are \$26,063,400,000. Of that total, \$11,802,400,000 is for strictly military aid and \$14,098,500,000 for economic.

On March 31, 1952, cumulative expenditures amounted to \$14,700,700,000. At the present rate of expenditure, it is estimated that this will increase to \$17,118,300,000 by June 30, 1952. This would leave an unexpended balance of \$8,945,100,000 at the end of the current fiscal year.

This has led to much confusion in public statements on the subject and the suggestion has been made that with \$8,945,100,000 of unspent funds on hand it would be unnecessary to authorize additional funds for fiscal 1953. However, within a few more weeks, by June 30, all of these unspent funds will have been obligated except for approximately \$400,000,000. Obligated funds remain available to meet contract payments for an additional 2 years without further congressional authorization.

As reported by the committee, H. R. 7005 authorizes \$6,901,100,000 in new funds, plus a carry-over of unobligated balances estimated at \$406,800,000, making an over-all total of \$7,307,900,000 available for obligation, of which \$4,952,800,000 is for military purposes, \$2,305,100,000 for defense support, economic and technical assistance, and \$50,000,000 for Spain.

Without these funds there would be no money available with which to place orders after June 30. The funds authorized in H. R. 7005 are required as a basis for contracts to be signed between July 1, 1952, and June 30, 1953. It is necessary to bear in mind that before the Defense Department can make a contract for production of tanks, for example, funds must have previously been appropriated for that purpose.

It may take from 11 months to 2 years to manufacture the tanks. By law, money to pay for them must be available when the contract is signed, even though payment is not made until their delivery over a year later. This time lag can run 2 years or more for aircraft down to 3 months for small arms. This is a complicated process, but it is standard Government procedure and it does not mean that the United States taxpayer pays taxes, the proceeds of which then lie idle in the Treasury. Money appropriated but not spent in the same

fiscal year does not add to the deficit of that fiscal year. It is provided through the Treasury only as needed to make payments when the tanks, aircraft, and so on are completed and delivered.

Reduced to its simplest terms, the issue becomes one of "Do we want to allow the Defense Department and the Mutual Security Agency to continue to contract for defense items, economic and technical assistance, or do we want a hiatus in the program?" A delay in appropriating can only mean a consequent delay in delivery of military items. Although we will have \$8,900,000,000 unexpended by June 30, practically all of it is already in the pipeline and in the process of being converted from money into military end items and defense support. If we delayed appropriating, we would simply be retarding the conversion process which is changing dollars into tanks, aircraft, machine guns, and other items for our mutual security.

At the end of March there was an unexpended balance of \$9,228,600,000 of military funds. A lot of people have gotten an idea that this fact has some connection with the amount of money needed for next year.

In the first place, this unexpended balance should not be thought of as money lying idle. It is really tanks, airplanes, guns, and so forth, in process of production. There are at present over 4,000 tanks worth \$2,900,000,000 being completed in United States factories which are to be shipped as part of the fiscal 1952 program. There are today approximately 3,000 jet fighters which cost a total of \$2,300,000,000 being completed in our factories which are included in the 1952 program. There are \$600,000,000 worth of mine sweepers being completed in shipyards which are to be paid for out of these unexpended funds.

This makes a total of \$5,800,000,000 of these unexpended funds which are represented by tanks, planes, and mine sweepers alone which are in process. The remainder is represented by such things as artillery pieces and fire-control equipment which take months to complete.

Unexpended balances are primarily military end items in the course of completion. They do not represent money waiting to be used.

On January 1, 1952, the strength of active and quickly mobilizable world-wide forces of our Western European allies was 5,250,000 men. This is an increase of about 1,500,000 men in 2 years.

The committed NATO combat-ready and reserve ground divisions in Western Europe by December 1952 will be 50 divisions.

Committed front-line NATO combat aircraft in Western Europe by December 1952 will approximate 4,000 aircraft.

Combat vessels—of which approximately one-half are major types—committed to NATO by December 1952 will number over 1,600.

In addition, there are today forces numbering over 1,000,000 men under arms in the eastern Mediterranean and Adriatic areas protecting the southern flank; they include over 50 strong divisions, 800 aircraft, and over 100 ships and vessels

As General Olmstead testified before our committee:

I might add that in terms of Europe, in fact, all of our partner nations, because of the more austere conditions to which they are experienced, the greater simplicity of their missions as compared to the possible missions of United States forces that might have to be committed on short notice in any part of the world, in any climate, our tables of organization and equipment for our partners are more austere than our own.

I will say that regarding those which are planned for commitment alongside our own forces, it would be almost tragic economy if we equipped them on a less effective scale from a fire-power standpoint.

These forces of our allies need to be made strong. Each division must have tanks, anti-aircraft weapons, and artillery. There must be jet fighters to withstand a Soviet attack. The equipment of some forces already in being has to be completed. The division just being organized must receive all of their arms and equipment by the end of this year if the 50 divisions we are counting on are to be ready.

The unexpended balances really represent to a large extent the fire power which the NATO forces will have and must have if they are to carry out their mission.

WHAT IS MEANT BY "OBLIGATION"

When we speak of "obligations" in reference to the military side of this program, we mean only one thing—contracts. An obligation is a contract. As Assistant Secretary of Defense McNeil stated to our committee:

We do not record anything as an obligation until it is a firm deal. Any preliminary discussions, any requests for submissions of proposals, are not recorded as obligations (hearings, p. 419).

A contract may be in the form initially of a letter of intent, which is accepted by the contractor. It will provide for payments being made as the contractor gets under way to accumulate inventories.

Mr. McNeil had this to say about the validity of a letter of intent:

A contract may be half delivered under the letter of intent, because in the making up of the definitive contract you will find the attorneys will be discussing some labor clause or the wording and punctuation of an escalator clause, or in the specifications there may be some discussion as to whether the wing tank will go 14 inches from the left spar or 13 inches. All those things will hold up the final execution of the definitive contract.

But in the meantime there exists a firm deal, a binding contract. It just is not explicit in various minute details. An accepted letter of intent has exactly the same force and effect as a contract except for the detailed specifications (hearings, p. 421).

When we talk about obligations in defense support, the situation is different. Funds are obligated for defense support and for economic aid when the Mutual Security Agency issues a procurement authorization. This is not, however, a contract. The Mutual Security Agency does not buy commodities. Transactions financed with Mutual Security Agency funds are normally handled through ordinary commercial channels. The foreign firm negotiates a contract with a United States supplier after a

procurement authorization has been issued. This is really an authorization to sign a contract. There is always a lag between giving the procurement authorization and the signing of a contract. This is necessary if you are going to have commercial dealings rather than Government buying.

DEFENSE SUPPORT

Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that the strongest attack coming from those who want to make meat-ax cuts in the proposed authorization will be made against the so-called defense support items, and I unhesitatingly say that to cut this part of the bill further would be a tragic mistake.

The bill as originally introduced provided \$1,819,200,000 for defense support. The committee cut this sum to \$1,637,300,000, or 10 percent.

Let us take a look at what defense support money would do toward rearming Europe:

Defense support is a sound investment because it yields many times its own cost in direct additions to NATO's military strength and therefore to our own security. Defense support has a multiplier effect on European production and therefore on the size of the defense program which Europe can support. This multiplier comes about because we supply under defense support only a small fraction of the raw materials and machine tools which go into Europe's workshop. Since the European countries add their own labor, factories, equipment, and materials, the value of the completed production is several times the cost of the defense support we provide. To take one example, \$100,000 of American machine tools financed with defense support have enabled the Copenhagen Ammunition Arsenal in Denmark to increase its yearly output of .30 caliber and other ammunition by \$460,000.

The defense support requested by the administration for the Lisbon plan countries of NATO, including Germany, amounts to \$1,400,000,000. Through its impact on the European economy it will make possible a \$1,600,000,000 increase in Europe's expenditures for the production of military hardware alone. This will mean more aircraft guns, jeeps, and destroyers produced in Europe for the European armies. So defense support more than pays for itself just in terms of the additional military production of hard goods which it makes possible. But defense support also results in higher European defense spending for the mobilization and training of troops and for the construction of airfields, barracks, and communication systems. These are especially important parts of the European defense program. Europe must provide the largest share of the ground troops, and all of the airfields, installations, and lines of communication for the Allied forces under General Ridgway's command. Almost half of Europe's defense budgets must go for the pay and training of its military forces. All these things are just as necessary as guns and ammunition if you are to have armies in being which can go into action when needed. Taking into account the additional spending in these areas, the European defense program will be raised in

total by the equivalent of \$3,333,000,000 as a result of our defense support. This means that each dollar of defense support contributes almost \$2.50 to the European defense effort. But even this is not the end of the story as to how dollars for defense support multiply into effective men available to fight if trouble breaks out. Money spent building up forces goes much further in Europe than it does in the United States. European costs for the pay, clothing, and subsistence of its military personnel are about one-quarter of the comparable costs for American personnel. Maintenance and training costs are also substantially lower for European units. In military terms, this \$3,333,000,000 of higher defense budgets made possible by our defense support represents the cost of 10 European divisions with that half of their equipment which is produced in Europe, plus 750 aircraft, 40 minesweepers, and 30 destroyer escorts. If the United States were to replace with our own forces and equipment the European forces and equipment only made possible by defense support, it would cost us about five times the amount of that defense support. Thus we are getting about a 5 for 1 return for our defense-support dollars.

The importance of the defense support side of the program is graphically shown by briefly analyzing the loss to our joint defense effort if we were to eliminate it. The \$1,400,000,000 provided for eight European NATO countries and Germany in defense support would reduce their production capacity to the point that their own planned expenditures of \$13,900,000,000 would have to be cut by \$3,300,000,000 to \$10,600,000,000.

It has been self-evident from the beginning that Western Europe can be defended only if our partners in the mutual security program make a maximum effort in terms of their own resources. We can only supply a part of the materials. We cannot ourselves build the European defense structure. Defense support, as provided in the present bill, will enable the Europeans to contribute more themselves at less cost to us. The vital importance of the defense support part of the program was stressed by General Gruenther when testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee.

In reply to a question by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] the General said:

I think * * * that the economic support and the military support are inseparable. I think from our own self-interest, and I am again not talking about money value because I do not know about that, it is wise to facilitate in every possible way the bolstering of these economies. To give you a specific illustration: The industrial establishments of these countries have received such a blow as a result of the war that to produce some of these items themselves is absolutely impossible. We feel they should be producing them, but the question of raw materials, the question of machine tools, represents, to mention only two items, a very, very difficult problem for them from an economic standpoint.

I have spent much time on the European part of the Mutual Security Program because it is that part that involves the largest authorization of money. But

it is, in the long run, hardly more important than those parts of the program that provide far smaller amounts of money for countries in the underdeveloped areas of the world. For some of those countries, the program would provide armaments; substantial quantities in Indochina and Formosa where the face of aggression is near and ominous, smaller amounts in a few other countries. But in most of the underdeveloped countries the principal objective is and must be to maintain the new found spirit of freedom and independence and to bring the peoples of those countries to a recognition that the West is the custodian and defender of these ideals.

This is the heart and purpose of the technical aid program. This concept was examined, considered, and worked over with great thoroughness by the Congress, and particularly by this House. It was enacted into law in 1950. The first appropriation was on the modest scale befitting a slow and long-term enterprise. But here again subsequent acts of Communist aggression have indicated that the point 4 type of program must also be made more immediately and largely effective. Its purpose, its ultimate objective, remain the same, but the goal of strengthening the will, spirit, and stability of these areas must in the present state of the world be reached at an earlier date. Hence these parts of the program are somewhat larger than they have been in prior years.

I should emphasize, however, that they are still small in relation to those parts of the program that deal directly with rearmament, and I should emphasize also that these relatively minor expenditures, if resolutely carried forward, will maintain the stability and strength of these areas so that the vastly more expensive burden of rearmament for their direct defense can, we hope, be avoided.

The members of the Foreign Affairs Committee recognize as well as any in this House the problems of our increasing debt and the dangers of an unbalanced budget. The committee has reduced the amount of this bill by just under a billion dollars. It is our view that this reduction brings the program down to the very limit of tolerable risk. We dare not recommend a deeper cut. This mutual-security program is an insurance policy for the safety and security of our country. When times have been hard, many of us in our own private life have foregone expenditures we would otherwise like to have made, and have indeed borrowed money, in order to meet premiums on policies of personal insurance that we had taken out to protect our families. I regard this mutual security program in precisely that light. This House faces a hard choice between adding heavier burdens to an already heavily laden economy on the one hand and, on the other, risking the national security by making it impossible to build up the defenses of the free world. This bill, onerous though it is, is a necessary insurance premium to guarantee as far as we can that our children and our children's children may live in a free world.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the beginning the gentleman asked a question as to whether our institutions in this country were in danger and he supplied a partial answer. But President Truman has said that budget cutters were aiding Stalin, and I think he included the gentleman in that general category. I wonder if the gentleman and his committee have given thought to the fact that an economic collapse can ruin the country just as much as a military defeat. I think our institutions are in danger, but how much longer can the taxpayers carry the burden of the world? Have you given any serious consideration to that matter and have you found an answer as to whether our institutions might be in danger, not from Stalin, but from an economic collapse in this country?

Mr. RICHARDS. I think any member of the committee or any Member of this Congress who has not given serious consideration to that has no business being here. I want to make this flat-footed statement to the Congress of the United States: What the world has to depend on more than anything else today is a solvent United States. When the majority of this committee reported the pending bill, we had to calculate and weigh the risk we were taking if we did not do this thing. We had to consider the danger of the United States being required to spend many billions more later on if we failed to make adequate provisions now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we had to take all those things into consideration.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In reference to the question propounded by the distinguished Member from Nebraska, and I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska; his question is most practical and fundamental. But without regard to the merits of the immediate situation that we are faced with to which the gentleman from South Carolina is addressing himself, in order to keep the record straight I would like to point out to my friend from Nebraska and others who might be interested that the gentleman from South Carolina who is now addressing us is and has been a part of the so-called economy group in this House that has been trying to reduce these expenditures. He is responsible more than anyone else for the billion cut that has already been made in committee on this bill.

I repeat, regardless of one's contentions about the merits of the proposal about which the gentleman is addressing us, he is and has been one of the strongest advocates and practitioners of economy generally. He is motivated here as elsewhere by the highest motives, and by what he thinks is for the best interests of his country.

Mr. RICHARDS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and, of course, I appreciate the anxiety of the gentleman from Nebraska concerning the matters he is talking about.

Now if you will let me say just a word about that. To my mind the two greatest dangers confronting the United States today are insolvency and the possibility of going to sleep in our battle against communism. To my mind the real issue is whether or not we are going to pay an insurance premium today to protect our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that our committee came to the House with this amount in the bill only because the majority believed that any other course would cost the United States more in the long run, and that if we cut further on this, which would weaken our allies, it would cost us more money, not less? Was it not because we believed this authorization would in the long run save us money which would otherwise have to be spent on our own defense, that reluctantly the majority of the committee came in with this.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman has said it. He has answered the question of the gentleman from Nebraska better than I could.

If I did not believe that the expenditures of these funds as we have cut them down by a billion dollars—and we may have gone a little too far—if I did not believe in the long run it would save money for the United States and save the lives of United States men, I would not be here today advocating it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to correct any impression that the gentleman is playing into the hands of Stalin when he cuts a billion dollars off this bill. I do not agree with the State Department and the Chief Executive that the gentleman should be so spoken of. I would have gone along with another cut, of perhaps another billion dollars. But the gentleman is carrying that label all over the world now, and I think it is a label the gentleman should not wear.

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not know what kind of label I may carry all over the world. I am trying to do my duty here. I want to say this, that so far as that billion dollar cut is concerned, we were obligated to make that cut in defense of the taxpayers of the United States if we could do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do believe there is room for more of a cut.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is up to the House. There are some men here who believe further reductions should be made in this bill. There are some men here who honestly believe we should not appropriate anything. I respect their views, even though I cannot agree with them. All I am trying to assure the gentleman from Nebraska is that I am honest in my own conclusions.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the gentleman from South Carolina if I correctly understood him to say that \$26,000,000,000 has been appropriated since 1948, the beginning of the Marshall plan?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. ARENDS. Was that inclusive of this six and nine-tenths billions or outside of that?

Mr. RICHARDS. Outside of that.

Mr. ARENDS. That would make approximately \$33,000,000,000 altogether, then?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman two questions. First, I am trying to learn what detailed study the committee made in the estimates in the suggested budget adopted at the Lisbon conference, because I understand the amount you are asking for now is really to implement the United States share, something like three and eight-tenths billions. I am particularly interested in what study might have been made of the details, because part of our problem has been the unrealistic scheduling that the proponents of these vast appropriations have proposed to us.

Mr. RICHARDS. We did go into the detailed scheduling of this very exhaustively. Most of the military end of it is classified. Frankly, I asked the Defense Department to declassify as much of this as it could. But military end items compose most of title I, and the greater part of the bill involves classified information.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was not asking for that information here. My question was how much detailed study the committee had made. I will tell you why I ask that question. For example, on page 45, last year we appropriated \$38,000,000 for South America, and the committee very rightly asked the question as to why those funds were still unobligated as of January 31, 1952, and we have this very interesting statement from the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Miller:

We had to wait for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to draw up the plans under the appropriation for the best use of the appropriation.

In other words, they get the money and then figure out what they are going to do with it next. Is that the situation we have on this Lisbon matter?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not true that we had to wait upon the making of bilateral agreements between the United States and South American countries before these funds could be obligated, and therefore since the act required these agreements with various nations, the executive branch of the Government could not enter into these agreements with these South American countries.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I believe the gentleman made the statement that there would be \$400,000,000 in unexpended balances in June, did I correctly understand the gentleman to say unexpended balances? I am sure he meant to say unobligated balances.

Mr. RICHARDS. I meant to say unobligated balance, and I thank the gentlewoman for calling that to my attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wonder if the gentleman would take about 5 minutes to go into the question that you have not touched on yet, and that is this question of economic aid and what is known as technical assistance, which seems to be spread out pretty well all over the world. There are some of us who are disturbed by the wide spread of this aid to practically every country in the world, and every continent on the face of the earth. Frankly, I am one who would like to be convinced on that subject and have not been. I am very sympathetic toward the program. I was rather disappointed when I found that all the cuts in the estimates that had been made came out of Europe, where it seems to me is the hub of our trouble. But these other things, technical aid, and so forth, scattered all over the world, have not suffered any of the cuts. I am just asking the gentleman if he will not go into that subject a little further.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say a little about that. There is almost \$5,000,000,000 in title I. That is for Europe. Out of that there is \$1,637,300,000 for economic support. We call it defense support. There is no doubt about its being economic aid. There are pages and pages of testimony in the hearings to show what that goes for, end items, such as dynamos, and materials that will go into military plants to enable them to increase their defense production. I remember one instance particularly, where \$100,000 in defense support for Denmark resulted in an ammunition production increase of almost a half million dollars a year.

If the gentleman wants me to read to the House, I have detailed breakdowns of what each country gets under the program in the way of defense support, economic and technical assistance, point 4, and so on.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was just trying to seek the reason behind these contributions of economic aid—or point 4 aid, as you choose to call it—in this widespread area. To be a little more specific, I see here that we are going to contribute to India \$115,000,000; to Pakistan, \$65,000,000; to Israel, \$79,000,000. I wonder in what respect they are contributing to our defense and to the defense of the democratic world. I do not mean to pick on those countries; I just took them because they were the larger items. What is the reason behind it

from the standpoint of defense of democracy? The whole business back of my question is the same question of how long and how far we can go in trying to support the economy of the whole world, and please do not regard it as an unfriendly question; I am asking for information.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have great admiration and respect for the gentleman from Virginia; I know how hard he has fought the battle of economy on this floor, but may I say to him that there are some parts of the world where we may invest wisely and moderately in programs promoting self-help. Some have felt that Europe is the main theater in the world conflict against communism. That may be true, but the battle line is drawn out all around the world.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is there not also a very, very practical consideration here? The United States having the productive capacity it has, yet is dependent for some of its most vital needs on these so-called backward areas that we are aiding. For the benefit of the gentleman from Virginia, I think it should be pointed out that the United States depends for 100 percent of its natural rubber supply on these areas; 100 percent of its tin supply; 100 percent of its chromite; 100 percent of its graphite; 100 percent of its industrial diamonds; 100 percent of its sisal; 99 percent of its nickel; 93 percent of its cobalt; 93 percent of its manganese; 55 percent of its lead; 42 percent of its copper; and 40 percent of its zinc.

If these areas keep up the process of disintegration that the Communists know so well how to capitalize on, we lose all those sources of vital materials. It is a matter of very vital concern to all Americans.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Connecticut is just 100 percent correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have been looking over the bill and the report and it seems there are 18 separate agencies set up and it looks to me like a tremendously cumbersome administrative set-up which needs to be completely revamped and cut down to some kind of a businesslike size.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that we think we have done a pretty good job in that connection. We put this operation under a single unified agency last year, we cut personnel 10 percent and in this bill we cut personnel an additional 10 percent. We have been trying to do the very thing the gentleman is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Virginia, it ought to be called to the attention of the House that on pages 48 to 56 of the committee report this technical assistance question is dealt with in considerable detail. But there is one further thing which in all candor must be said. The gentleman from South Carolina and the committee know of my own uneasiness about the fact that there is an awful lot in this bill, sir, that is called technical assistance, but which is not technical assistance. I regret that the various kinds of aid to the underdeveloped areas are not separated in the bill so that they can be laid before the House with exactly the right labels on them.

There are four main kinds of aid in the bill: Military end items to four countries in Asia, and to Western Europe, Greece, and Turkey; the second is defense support to enable them to build up their own arsenals and air bases and economies so that they can produce for themselves the largest possible proportion of their defense needs; the third is technical assistance; and fourth is economic Marshall plan type of aid to some of the so-called underdeveloped areas.

I regretted that I was not able to work out a satisfactory amendment whereby we could break the last two down and be perfectly honest with the House in making clear which is which and why. There are areas where the threat of Communist conquest from within has to be met in the next year or two—certain areas in the Middle East, south and southeast Asias, and a few other places. We have to put with the longer-term and slower-moving technical assistance some economic aid. Whether the amount provided is right or not is questionable, but we have to furnish some aid in essential commodities, in addition to training, or else those countries are going down. In the case of India and south Asia out of the \$150,000,000 provided for so-called technical cooperation, only about \$13,000,000 is for personnel engaged in technical assistance and \$137,000,000 is for commodities. The case for each ought to be made on its own merits. It will endanger future support of a sound technical assistance program to have purely economic aid, however justified, lumped under technical cooperation. I think that, before the debate is over, that will be spelled out in detail so that we understand exactly what we are doing and why.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great degree of unity in our committee; unity in admiration of our fine chairman, in admiration and sympathy for each other, and unity in voting to bring this bill to the floor. There the unity stops this time because there are divergent views on various parts of this mammoth piece of legislation.

A "PACKAGE" BILL

In the first place, this is a package bill. It is labeled "Mutual Security" but there is a great deal of it that is not very mutual and has very little to do with our security. For instance, there are provisions in here for Arab and Jewish ref-

ugees, point 4, United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, provisions for ocean freight for relief packages, \$10,000,000 for resettlement of refugees, \$17,000,000 for United Nations technical assistance. This is a gathering together of practically all the foreign-policy items that require money this year, to authorize them in one bill. I do not disapprove of this package plan; in fact, I helped invent it. In the Eightieth Congress we were faced with a series of bills that had an April 1 deadline, and we realized there would not be time to have hearings and floor debate on each one, so we put them together into a package. The vote against this plan was the only strictly partisan vote in our committee. Our friends of the then minority stormed against the package approach, and their supporters, the pro-administration commentators and columnists, said the Republicans were trying to obstruct and delay, but the package bill that year went through the House March 31, 1948. The package plan has been adopted by the present majority and by the administration ever since. They have never made a deadline such as we made in the Eightieth Congress.

THE COMMUNIST THREAT

But while it is well to have in mind that this is more than a mutual security bill, yet the vast amount in this bill is for military aid, and a large amount of the nonmilitary authorizations have to do with the grim and deadly threat to our security by godless, ruthless communism, clear around the world; a threat that is military, the threat of the use of force; economic, the threat that we may bleed ourselves white in getting ready for a war that may never come; political, the threat that we may lose our liberties at home in the effort to meet these other threats. All this amounts to a very deadly threat. While there are those who would have us withdraw to our own borders in the face of this threat, many millions of our people, particularly our young men, have seen the war-devastated countries of Europe and Asia, and feel that if war must come, we should plan to fight away from home, on friendly soil, if possible, and not fight alone. It is quite interesting to note that because of this every avowed candidate for President on either ticket is in favor of a continuation of some form of mutual security, of military aid to those who are ready and willing to fight in the common cause. Every candidate for President supports that policy. It is also significant that only one candidate for President, Mr. Averell Harriman, who is also the administrator of all this, says of the original administration proposal "If you touch it, I will cry." He says in substance, "We must have all or there is no use of having any." All this leaves a problem of responsibility for the Congress, particularly the House, where we have but one Presidential hopeful, to determine how much should be expended in this effort.

AMOUNTS INVOLVED

Now I want to discuss this matter of how much is involved. If any of you care to turn to the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A3006, you

will find a table I inserted which shows that this bill, as amended, plus the unexpended balance of Mutual Security Act appropriations, plus other planned United States expenditures, will make \$18,098,200,000 available for foreign aid beginning June 30, 1952. I said, \$18,098,200,000. There is a mistake in the printed table in the RECORD. It should be as follows:

Foreign aid available June 30 1952	
[In millions of dollars]	
Unexpended balances June 30 (report, p. 30).....	8,945.1
H. R. 7005, authorizes.....	6,901.1
H. R. 7005, United States military transfers (p. 22 of bill).....	1,000.0
United States military expenditures abroad (hearings, p. 1053).....	1,052.0
Total.....	17,898.2
H. R. 7005, excess equipment (p. 29 of bill).....	200.0
Total.....	18,098.2
MILITARY AID	
Unexpended balances.....	7,894.3
H. R. 7005, authorizes.....	4,596.0
H. R. 7005, United States transfers.....	1,000.0
Total.....	13,490.3
Excess equipment.....	200.0
Total.....	13,690.3
ECONOMIC AID	
Unexpended balance, including Spain.....	1,050.8
H. R. 7005, authorizes.....	2,305.1
United States military expenditures abroad.....	1,052.0
Total.....	4,407.9
For Europe—title I—amounts available are as follows:	
MILITARY	
Unexpended.....	6,540
H. R. 7005.....	3,316
U. S. Transfers.....	1,000
Total.....	10,856
Excess equipment.....	200
Total.....	11,056
ECONOMIC	
Unexpended.....	828.2
H. R. 7005.....	1,637.3
U. S. military expenditures.....	1,052
Total.....	3,517.5
Grand total.....	14,573.5
Through off-shore procurement and transfers, military funds can be used for additional economic aid in Europe, as follows:	
[In millions of dollars]	
H. R. 7005 (p. 22) off-shore procurement 10 percent transfers of title I total (MSA, 101b).....	1,000
H. R. 7005, title I, 4,953.3, 10 percent.....	495.3
H. R. 7005, Ribicoff amendment.....	100.0
Economic aid (see above).....	3,517.5
Total.....	5,112.8

If you will look on page 20 of the report you will find that out of the \$11,500,000,000 available for military aid, only \$1,796,000,000 was shipped by February 29, 1952.

I have been shocked and disappointed and dismayed year after year to find that the military were not sending abroad the arms that Congress had authorized and appropriated for. It is one of those things where you cannot make it up all in a hurry.

In any case, using the guesses, which have not been very happy guesses in the past, but using the guesses of the executive branch as to what they are actually going to spend and deliver up to June 30, 1952, and it will be a better record than they have ever made before, there will be unexpended balances on June 30, 1952, of \$8,945,100,000. H. R. 7005 authorizes \$6,910,100,000. That is, there was a cut of \$998,900,000 over the executive request.

Then on page 22 of the bill H. R. 7005 you will find authorization for transfer of a billion dollars of our military equipment to this program whenever it is needed. That was part of a suggestion made by our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] last year. He sponsored it and I was sort of a cosponsor in committee. Thus we make a billion dollars of our own gigantic military build-up available to this program, if necessary. I know the military will be reluctant to do this, but that provision takes care of a period in the future when there might be an emergency arise and certain of our planes, tanks, and guns might be needed immediately on the European front, to be used by the forces of other nations rather than by our own forces.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Did I correctly understand the gentleman, then, that if this transfer was effectuated the foreign-aid program could still be seven and nine-tenths billions?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. Let me put it this way: With the military authorization there is now more military and nonmilitary aid available in this bill than there was when the bill came to the committee because the total has been cut \$998,900,000, and this additional billion of authorization has been put in, therefore, the net result is that greater amounts are available than when the bill came to the committee.

Mr. ARENDS. There is room for additional cuts.

Mr. VORYS. I think so.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say there were approximately \$8,000,000,000 of unexpended funds available?

Mr. VORYS. Unexpended balances. If the gentleman will refer to page 31 of the committee report, he will find the details. The amount is \$8,945,100,000.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. How much of that money is unobligated?

Mr. VORYS. All but \$350,000,000, it is proposed, will be obligated by the end of the year.

OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

Let us talk for a minute on this obligation and expenditure proposition. When money is spent, you know it is spent, but "obligated" is one of the most elastic terms I have heard in Washington for a long time.

For instance, I interrogated Mr. W. J. McNeil, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Defense, and found out that they have not only provision for changes and provision for termination at the convenience of the Government in every contract over \$1,000 but they also make contracts subject to future appropriations—hearings page 419. In this bill we provide that money that is de-obligated can be used again without reappropriation because it is quite natural in a vast program, particularly involving intricate military equipment, that after the money is obligated, you may change your mind, for instance, instead of making a thousand of one kind of equipment you may decide to make 500 of something else, and you cancel the original contracts. I asked Mr. McNeil how many military contracts for equipment had had changes in them. He said that for the hard-to-get, long-lead-time items there is practically no contract outstanding in which changes in specifications have not caused price changes or changes of that kind. That is quite natural in this business of planning a military build-up. Every time you find out, particularly in combat, that a weapon can be improved, you ought to change it. So that this obligation fastens an obligation on the contractor, but not on the Government. We find therefore that the NATO-Lisbon program for 25 divisions in being, and 25 more ready, and 4,000 planes by the end of this year is firm so far as the executive departments are concerned, but NATO is provisional after the end of this year. We find that those obligations as far as the Defense Department is concerned are provisional. Everything is to be provisional except what the Congress does. There are a number of us who feel that we should be a little bit provisional and should hold back some of the requested appropriations for the end of this program.

The military program for Europe, which is of course, the big item, involves long lead time on planes, tanks, and naval craft. Not one dime, get this, not one dime of the amount authorized in this bill be spent in fiscal year 1953—not one dime will be spent before July 1, 1953, and of this authorization \$1,240,000,000 will not be spent until fiscal year 1955, beginning in June 30, 1954. Of course, we all recognize that we must plan ahead for these items, but it is questionable whether we are justified in making plans that far ahead for Europe when Europe is unable to make firm plans of her own that far ahead.

Again referring to the summary of how we get this \$18,098,200,000, I have mentioned the unexpended balances 8,945.1, the amount of this bill \$6,900,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000 of military transfers. Then, you will find on page 1053 of the hearings, right at the very end of the hearings, this item of United States military expenditures abroad, outside of this

legislation, which will go through European banks in the 15 countries that need economic support—expenditures for infrastructure—for buying supplies for our troops, expenditures that give economic aid abroad next year amounting to \$1,052,000,000. Then, the bill H. R. 7005 provides \$200,000,000 additional in excess equipment. There is a provision in the law for declaring excess equipment, even though we may feel that we do not have any excess. At any rate, we can well count that in the total. That brings the total to \$18,090,200,000 of which \$13,690,300,000 is military, and \$4,407,900,000 is economic.

EUROPE

Let us turn to title I—Europe—and think about that for a minute. The preoccupation with Europe is shown not only in dollars, but in words. Seventy-six percent of the original proposal was for Europe. We have heard from one candidate for President, opposing excessive reductions for Europe. It is quite interesting that 24 percent of the total is for outside of Europe, of which that candidate knows not nearly as much as we know here, but in any case Europe is of particular interest.

It seems to me the great mistake that we have been making is in saying that the defense of Europe is vital to the defense of the United States.

The cold fact of security is that the defense of Europe is very important to us, but not vital. We could live if they fell. If the defense of Europe were vital to our defense, that would mean that if the Soviets overran Europe tomorrow, our vital defense having been stricken down, there would be nothing left for us to do but to surrender. But there is not anyone in the United States who thinks we are going to surrender to the Soviets if Europe is overrun. Therefore, the difference between "vital" and "important" is something that we ought to make clear in these bills, because in Europe every time we say, "The defense of Europe is vital to the security of the United States," they say, "Well, if you want to defend yourselves over here, go ahead. We will help you from time to time with your defense." If we would make clear just what the facts are about our policy, it might be that we could get a little more military effort over there; if we would make clear that we are going to do our part but not their part, they might do more.

DEFENSE SUPPORT

Now, let us look into this defense support for a minute. That is a new label put on something that started with the Marshall plan. You will find in the hearings that defense support, as proposed by the executive, is figured exactly the same way as they figured the Marshall plan money. That is, they had some experts figure out the theoretical balance of payments that the countries ought to have to live in the style in which the experts felt they should live, and that the difference in dollars was the amount that we had to make up. You will find, however, that on this defense support there were no promises made. Mr. Harlan Cleveland is Assistant MSA Director for Europe. Mr. C. Tyler Wood is Associate

MSA Deputy Director. They were the key men in our hearings—see hearings, page 535:

Mr. VORYS. Did we promise \$1,400,000,000 defense support at Lisbon?

Mr. CLEVELAND. No, sir; we did not promise any.

Mr. WOOD. There was no dollar commitment at Lisbon.

Mr. VORYS. I have asked for the Lisbon figures and have obtained them from Mr. Harri-man's staff, but they are marked in big red letters "Secret." In any case, you are sure that nobody on behalf of the United States Government has promised \$1,400,000,000 defense support to anybody. Is that right?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I am sure of that.

NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURES

In this country, we are reducing our nondefense expenditures. In 12 of the 14 NATO countries—see hearings, pages 100-110—nonmilitary government expenditures are to be increased. Britain's remains the same. Turkey alone, of our NATO allies, is to reduce nondefense spending.

THE MULTIPLIER FACTOR

Now, you will hear a lot of talk about a multiplier factor. In some way, if we put in the \$1,400,000,000 that we did not promise, in addition to \$3,300,000,000 of military aid, in addition to the \$1,000,000,000 offshore procurement, in addition to the \$1,052,000,000 that our military forces are going to spend there—if we put in this defense-support money, we are supposed to get a multiplier effect, so that we will get a lot more defense for it.

I asked Mr. Cleveland about that—hearings, page 515. I said, after we had heard a lot on this multiplier business:

Mr. Cleveland, as I understand your statement, the hardware goes up \$1,500,000,000 and we put in \$1,400,000,000; is that right?

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. I think we all ought to bear that in mind when we hear about our contribution being multiplied two or three times.

Now, on page 47 of the committee report you will find an elaborate table that looks as if cutting down on defense support would lose so many vehicles, aircraft, so many weapons, and so forth. I interrogated Mr. Cleveland about that table—hearings, pages 537-540. I asked him:

I wonder if you could just answer the question that I stated. Does the subtraction of the with-and-without defense-support items for aircraft mean the amount of aircraft materials and machinery we would send to Europe?

Mr. CLEVELAND. No, sir. This table does not have anything to do with imports of materials into Europe. * * *

Mr. VORYS. Still looking at your table on defense support, you apparently estimate that without defense support, these countries could do just about as well, within \$300,000,000, this coming year as last year.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Somewhat less.

Thus the multiples of one and four-fifths billions gets results of only three hundred million, according to this chart.

ECONOMIC AID FOR EUROPE

Referring once more to the table I have given you they have an unexpended balance in economic aid of \$828,200,000 for Europe. The bill proposes that they

will get \$1,637,300,000 in defense support. Next, military expenditures outside of this bill \$1,052,000,000; that is a total of \$3,517,500,000. But through off-shore procurement they will get \$1,000,000,000 more. That is, the bill provides that we must spend \$1,000,000,000 of our military money in Europe where they get the benefit of the dollars, and economic aid through getting the dollars; and it is a good plan. Then they can transfer 10 percent of the total of title I.

That is \$495,300,000 there, so that with the Ribicoff amendment of \$100,000,000 that could be used in Europe, there are availabilities, through transfers and otherwise of \$5,112,800,000 for economic aid to Western Europe. That is the item that I think could stand a reduction without hurting anybody and with great benefit to the taxpayers here.

WINDING UP ECA

I helped to bring the Marshall plan to the floor of this House in the Eightieth Congress in 1948, and one of the battles we had was to hold in the 4-year period. That 4-year period expires June 30, 1952. I regret to say that in conference last year we put in a provision that has been construed by the President as authorizing the President to extend ECA, which would otherwise go out of existence on June 30, by writing a letter—we have legislation by letter writing. The law provided, in section 502 (c) of the Mutual Security Act, "not later than April 1, 1952, the President shall inform the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives which of the powers, functions and responsibilities transferred to the Director by subsection (b) (2) are found by the President to be necessary to enable the Director after June 30, 1952, to carry out the duties conferred upon him by section 503. On March 26, the President sent us a letter. Instead of picking out which powers were necessary he just said "all of them except these seven are necessary." The committee disagreed on one of them and canceled that, so that all of ECA except six somewhat unimportant powers are prolonged, are restored, are prevented from being repealed and this is done by a letter of the President.

I propose to submit an amendment to correct this and have the Congress preserve the proper sections, and I shall ask permission to put it in my remarks at this point:

AMENDMENTS TO EFFECTUATE REPEAL OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT

1. On page 14, line 1, after "and of", strike out "the Economic Cooperation Act of 1928, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 503 of this act."

2. On page 15, line 4, amend subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) Amend section 101 (a) (2) to read as follows: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed to provide assistance to any country covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection in accordance with the provisions of section 503 of this act; and in addition balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this paragraph unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be

continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

3. On page 16, line 13, amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Amend section 203 to read as follows: 'In order to further the purpose of this act in Africa and the Near East there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed \$55,000,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized. Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available under section 503 of this act and the act for international development (22 U. S. C. 1557).'"

4. On page 18, line 4, strike out "(b) At the end of subsection 302 (a)" and insert the following:

"(b) In the second sentence of subsection 302 (a) strike out the words 'the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522), and' and insert in lieu thereof 'Section 503 of this act and the applicable provisions' and at the end of such subsection."

5. On page 20, after line 22, insert the following:

"(c) Amend section 503 by inserting '(a)' after '503' by redesignating paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) as (1), (2), and (3) respectively, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is repealed.

"(2) Of the powers, functions, and responsibilities transferred to the Director for Mutual Security by section 502 (b) (2) of this act, only those which are exercised pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, enumerated in paragraph (3) of this subsection and are not in conflict with the other provisions of this act, as amended, may be exercised after June 30, 1952. Of the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred on the President or the Secretary of State by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, only those conferred by the provisions of that act, as amended, which are referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection may be exercised after June 30, 1952.

"(3) The provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, referred to above are the following: Sections 104 (e) and (f); 107; subsections (c) and (d) of section 109; 110 (a) and (b); 111; 112; 113; subsections (d), (h), and (i) of section 114; 115 (a); paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10) of section 115 (b); subsections (d), (h), and (j) of section 115; section 117 (c); section 119; and section 120. Where any of the above provisions refer to the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, such reference shall be deemed to be the purpose of this act, as amended."

"(d) In subsection (a) of section 504, strike out all after 'Senate' and insert in lieu thereof a period and the following sentences: 'The Deputy Director shall receive compensation of \$17,500 per annum. The special representative in Europe shall receive the same compensation and allowances as a Chief of Mission, class 1, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999) and have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. The Deputy Special Representative in Europe shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a Chief of Mission,

class 3, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999) and have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary."

Renumber subsequent subsections accordingly.

6. On page 26, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "the Economic Cooperation Act" and insert in lieu thereof "section 503 of this act."

EUROPEAN UNIFICATION

On unification the committee report says—page 13—"only by unification will Europe ultimately be able to defend and support itself. We have some strong language in the bill, but we should provide that after, say June 30, 1953, military money to Europe goes only to the European army, the European defense community, only to an organization that is by that time hoped to be a going concern. In that way we would know we are not putting military money on a dead horse; in that way we would encourage unification.

POINT 4

Now, let me point out a few figures in connection with point 4. For point 4 they are requesting four times the number of experts they had last year but they are also asking for four times the money to spend on economic aid that they are for experts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is very hard to sort out point 4 because economic aid is carried on under point 4, as the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, and they have technical experts under MSA. But to give you some sort of interesting figures as to the totals that this bill provides, there will be 4,070 experts and technicians sent all over the world, there will be 8,470 foreigners brought here to learn more about the good way of life; but with all of that we will be spending more than four times that amount for personnel, a total of \$440,000,000, for economic aid, wells, dams, water projects, flood-control items and that sort of thing all over the world.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman happens to know that, generally speaking, I agree with his thinking on the subject he has been discussing; but I am wondering if the gentleman will not agree with me that his committee might have met and dealt with this question in a more realistic manner. The gentleman has been discussing point 4. I am wondering if he would not likewise agree with me that point 4 has been criminally abused?

Mr. VORYS. It has been fantastically swollen beyond any possibility of doing the kind of job we thought it should do.

Mr. COX. The gentleman says, in effect, that the purpose of the legislation is to improve our position, to strengthen us in a military sense, and that the intention is to extend assistance to countries in other parts of the world that are making a common cause with us. I would like to ask the gentleman, particularly with reference to

what is proposed for India, Pakistan, and Israel, what common cause are those countries making with us? Is not the contribution there made in the nature of relief? As a matter of fact, in making this contribution to India, are we not strengthening and are we not expending that money in a country where Russian influence holds them within a firm, iron grip?

Mr. VORYS. No; I do not think the Russian influence is that strong. You will hear a lot about India before we are through. I can say this about India: During my service on Committee Five in the United Nations, on the crucial questions that came up, the representative of India was not neutral; he was hostile, and at times insulting to my country and to me, and voted with the Soviets. So that I cannot visualize the cooperation, the mutual security, that might be gained through this vast program that Ambassador Chester Bowles, with his ever-expansive ideas, is proposing out there. I cannot see how that is closely tied in with our mutual security.

Mr. COX. The gentleman recalls his visit to Strasbourg last fall where a meeting of representatives was held.

Mr. VORYS. I certainly do.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman recall they took the position almost unanimously that any further assistance extended by the United States should be conditioned upon the European countries meeting certain requirements?

Mr. VORYS. Unification must be a requirement.

Mr. COX. Are those conditions laid down in the pending bill?

Mr. VORYS. They are not laid down sufficiently clearly in my judgment and I hope an amendment to make that more clear will be offered.

Mr. COX. Is there not a lot of boondoggling in here then?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I take this time to comment on section 2, paragraph (b) page 13, to which the gentleman referred when he spoke of the need for unification in Europe. I find this language which I would like the gentleman to interpret, if he will:

In order to provide further encouragement to such efforts, the Congress believes it essential that this act should be so administered as to support concrete measures for political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe.

Do I understand from the gentleman's comment that this provision would give the administrators a chance both to bargain and to exert pressure to effect change in the integral political life and purposes of the individual countries we are supposed to be helping? Would such an attempt not endanger the cooperation that the bill seeks to win?

Mr. VORYS. It would give the Administrator authority to press toward the purposes that have just been stated.

Mrs. CHURCH. In addition, would the provisions of this bill permit us to

introduce some good old-fashioned Yankee trading for the protection of our own interests?

Mr. VORYS. It would. I have found our administrators very good at Yankee trading and that is why I suggest we might write in some more forceful language.

Mrs. CHURCH. I certainly hope that the gentleman will be successful in that attempt.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I just want to ask this question: The gentleman is for military aid; he is for defense support; he is for technical assistance; he is even for some economic aid, but he thinks we have done too much in the bill; is that not right?

Mr. VORYS. I am for cutting out European recovery money, and that can be done by appropriate amendments; cut it down to defense necessities.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact also that the defense-support provision is essential for materials which have to be bought by the European countries outside of their borders?

Mr. VORYS. No; it is also for commodities. It is for wheat, butter, fats, and oils. Unless merely feeding soldiers is defense support, much of this does not come under that classification. I think we are through with that kind of defense support.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has referred to an item of something more than a billion dollars for transfer of arms, and so forth. Does that mean transfer of arms manufactured in this country but sent to Europe and other countries?

Mr. VORYS. That amendment means that if in an emergency we had tanks that had been built for our own use and they needed those tanks in a division over there, they could be transferred.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is included as a part of this \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the excellent statement he made on a very obscure aspect of this bill. I would like to direct the gentleman's attention to the requirement that participation by private enterprise be incorporated and note they have now directed the State Department, or the Mutual Security Director and the Technical Cooperation Administration to break down the barriers to private investment overseas. Does the gentleman have any confidence that those agencies are going to accomplish very much in that direction?

Mr. VORYS. Based on past racing form, no. I have given up hope that they will do much except government-to-government programs.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, let us face reality. It is not the last time Congress will be asked to authorize large sums of money for foreign assistance. The passage of this bill will not eliminate Communistic imperialism. Neither will the passage of this bill allow us to withdraw from our worldwide responsibilities.

As long as the United States remains the leader of the free world, and the Soviet of the slave, we as a Nation will be called upon to contribute heavily of our substance. No possible combination of nations without the United States can stop the Kremlin from seeping through the weak dikes of the world and flooding our Western civilization. It is important to have nations go along with us as willing allies.

The American people have the courage, the intelligence, and the determination to face the facts. They will adopt and follow to a successful conclusion the course which these facts show must be taken. But they must know why they are being asked to act.

From the inception of the foreign aid programs, the executive branch has pictured them as short range and crisis induced. The program was to end soon when the particular crisis was over. The particular act was a last push. This thesis accepted by Congress, the reports and the debates continually fall into a pattern of justification either to repair war's devastation, stopping communism or making us militarily strong.

We started foreign military assistance by giving military aid to Greece and Turkey. The law which inaugurated the Marshall plan provided that it was to end June 30, 1952. The Mutual Security Act provides that it is to end in 1954. The entire record consists of measures presented to Congress on the basis that if this specific and limited action is taken, the situation will be normalized. Such an approach is wrong, dangerous, and filled with illusions. Crisis will continue to follow crisis in international affairs. Troubles will be with us for many future and uncertain years.

Congress has collaborated with the executive rationale. Maybe the road to large foreign grants have been smoothed thereby. Such an approach, however, has been self-defeating. No firm foundation has been laid for long range foreign policy. It has placed us in a position of being unable to take any one of a variety of courses of action unless they can be squeezed into military justifications.

This Nation should be wide-eyed and clear as to what we are about. To get around time limits and economic assistance, we substitute the phrase "defense support." Next year it will be another "gimmick." Frustration and anger will atmosphere the legislation instead of understanding.

The effectiveness of the aid programs is watered down. One of the consequences of the policy of basing each foreign assistance program on a current crisis has been that the people of nations re-

ceiving our help have been confused. There is no escaping the fact that many people in the world today regard the United States along with Russia as threatening the peace of the world. The United States is feared and suspect in spite of this aid. Communism remains strong in France and Italy. Our wisdom and aims are doubted by nations which should understand us and have confidence in us.

The following of such a course is due to the feeling by many that the American people must be constantly reassured. They must be fed a verbal "pap." However, once aware of the facts of international life, this Nation will assume the burdens of leadership willingly even though unhappily.

First, let every American understand that Russia has under arms, and has had since the end of the war, 175 divisions. Russia has 20,000 airplanes, of which 4,000 are jets. There are 500 submarines in the Soviet Navy. Germany had only 60 submarines at the beginning of the last war. Soviet forces are deployed in Eastern Germany and in the Far East so that they can attack immediately. No calling up of reserves or bringing up of supplies is necessary.

The fact that this military power has not yet been used does not mean that it will not be used. There is no escaping the fact that the Soviets are hostile to the United States and that they are militarily strong.

Nevertheless, it must never be forgotten that the men in the Kremlin prefer subversion, unrest, and revolution to war. They are the greatest masters in history of subversive techniques. Wherever internal unrest, dissension, or weakness are present, the Soviet has an organization and a well-worked-out plan in readiness where a minority, subject to its control, can take over the government. One of the greatest dangers confronting the United States today is that we may concentrate so intently on meeting Soviet military aggression that we neglect the defense against subversion.

A second fact which Americans cannot shut their eyes to is the situation in those parts of the world where new nations have recently emerged from colonial status and where other races feel themselves for the first time free from control by Europeans. Peoples still under the control of foreign nations seek to follow the countries already independent.

In many cases the Soviet did not cause this unrest; they do fan the flames. It cannot be repressed or eliminated. The United States must accept the fact that the situation exists.

The Soviet is ever ready to turn this situation to its advantage. It has the organization and the technique for taking over any government which cannot cope with the problems which have to be faced.

One of the principal challenges confronting the United States is whether or not we can prevent these people, largely in Asia and Africa, from falling under Soviet domination. If these areas fall to the Soviet we will be irreparably weaker and the power of the Kremlin will be greater.

The United States needs not only to spend money to maintain a program of sufficient range to help these people attain a status where they can support and defend themselves, but to supply constructive leadership and statesmanship as well.

A third hard reality confronting the United States is that in important respects we have become a "have not" nation. Our position of world leadership is due, in part at least, to the fact that throughout our history we have had within our own borders nearly all the resources which our industries required and the foodstuffs that our people consumed. To a greater extent than any other nation, we have been able to supply our own needs.

Modern technology, however, has altered this situation. There are a number of minerals today of small importance in terms of tonnage or of dollars but which are of vital importance for the productive capacity of our Nation. The United States is dependent on foreign sources for 100 percent of our industrial diamonds, 100 percent of our tin, 99 percent of our nickel, 93 percent of our cobalt and our manganese, and 92 percent of our mercury, to name only a few. I am making no mention of atomic-energy materials. In addition to this, some of the most important materials which we have always obtained at home are becoming exhausted. Today we import 42 percent of our copper and our steel industry is being relocated to permit the use of imported iron ore.

These facts mean that if we permit ourselves to be cut off from the resources of the rest of the world, transportation and communication as we know it today, automatic and labor-saving machinery, much of the comfort in everyday living and certain of the things we regard as necessities cannot be continued. We must work with other nations to keep supplies of important materials available to us and to prevent them from falling under Soviet domination.

Consideration should be given finally to the importance to the United States of expanding our markets overseas. Our industrial capacity as a whole is now about double what it was in 1940, only a dozen years ago. What are we going to do if it becomes possible for us to curtail military production? We cannot let our factories close and our people remain unemployed. It will be vital to this country that export markets be available to us.

The underdeveloped areas of the world deserve particular attention in this respect. A noteworthy aspect of the post-war boom has been the forward spurt of trade in item after item sold to some countries long characterized by low incomes. Venezuela took \$24,000,000 of dairy products in 1950, up from a little more than \$1,000,000 in 1938. India took \$30,000,000 of industrial machinery in 1950 as against \$4,000,000 in 1938. The demand for the produce of American factories exists if the people of the world can be brought into our market.

In this connection it should be emphasized that the United States normally exports several billion dollars more than it imports. Since the war our ex-

ports have exceeded our imports by about \$5,000,000,000 per year although this balance was as low as \$1,500,000,000 in 1950 and as high as \$9,500,000,000 in 1947. Foreign nations cannot pay for our exports unless they have dollars. We discourage their earning dollars by shipping their products to us as indicated by our recent action in raising the tariff on cheese. Is it more politically expedient for the United States to give aid to foreign nations so that they can buy our goods than to lower our import barriers so that they can earn the necessary dollars? If so, let us at least tell the American people they will continue paying a subsidy to our agriculture, mines and industry to make this trade possible and keep our friends afloat. Nevertheless, if the United States is to remain an industrial nation with all it means to us in high productivity and a high standard of living, we must have a world market. We are geared to a world economy. If we have to readjust to a hemispheric economy or a continental economy we will all of us be poorer.

The international adjustments necessary to remove world tensions are proceeding but progress is painfully and disappointingly slow. I think our assistance program might have been administered in a manner that might have given greater incentives to speed in cooperation and provided penalties for delay. Nevertheless, we have to recognize that the political and organizational changes necessary will take many years to complete. Governmental institutions will have to be established, national constitutions modified, industries uprooted and in some cases populations redistributed. There is no way that these things can be accomplished in months. Until they have been accomplished, the United States will feel continuous tension and face a succession of crises.

All of these things mean that we should approve the legislation before us with our eyes open. It cannot be truthfully said that all we have to do is equip X number of foreign divisions and our problems will be over. We must recognize that that is not the whole story.

Arms are only part of the over-all picture. It is impossible to separate a nation's military requirements from its basic and essential civilian needs. They are all part of the same ball of wax. To force the aid program into military compartments only will get us into actual as well as intellectual difficulties.

The constant talk of arms scares a war-weary world and casts suspicion on our aims. It lets the Soviet, who arm in silence and secrecy, sell its phony peace campaigns under the symbol of the white dove.

The Congress cannot legislate or appropriate the Kremlin out of business. We cannot vote tranquility for the people in Asia and Africa who believe they are on their way to better things. We cannot by law alter the technology of the electronic and the atomic age. Every one of these situations presents us with complex and long-range problems of foreign policy.

Further, let us not kid ourselves that our problem is military and economic only and that it will end in 1954. We

must also recognize that man is a spiritual, emotional, and moral being. He is not a scientific automaton whose actions can be predicted under any given circumstances. The burning concepts of our Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights reborn for the world could impart more than dollars alone.

It is to be regretted that those charged with the execution of foreign policy do such a poor job of presentation and explanation. However, Congress, too, has a responsibility for policy and the national interest. Congress cannot shirk its responsibility. We must stop looking for the simple and pat answers. We must realize that with international problems 2 plus 2 invariably equals 3 or 5 and not 4.

When these programs are thus approached reality and substance will start filling out the bare bones of our foreign policy. Maturity will give our leadership direction and strength free from frustration and fear.

I would like to spend the remaining time allotted to me in discussing the argument of the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio deserves that particular attention and discussion. There has been no other member of the committee that has worked as hard and as diligently on this legislation. But I think the gentleman from Ohio, too, will admit that there were many other members of this committee that were most critical during the entire conduct of these hearings. In truth, I think it can be safely said that never has there been a chairman of any committee so independent of the executive branch than our own chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. Constantly he asked the \$64 question. I think the gentleman from Ohio, too, will admit that there was no member on the committee that gave our executive branch a harder time in the committee than I did.

The gentleman talks about \$18,098,000,000 available instead of the amount that we talk about in the bill of \$6,901,000,000. He would lead the House to believe that we have this large reservoir of funds that have not been used and that should be used. As a matter of fact he fails to tell the House that when he talks about these \$8,000,000,000 of unexpended funds these are obligated funds. The \$8,000,000,000 do not represent money in the Treasury to be used for any particular purpose. It represents goods in the pipelines. The \$8,000,000,000 that he talks about being unexpended actually represent contracts that have been let. They represent 4,000 tanks at \$2,900,000,000. They represent 3,000 jet fighters at \$2,300,000,000. They represent mine sweepers at \$600,000,000. They represent artillery pieces, they represent fire-control equipment, they represent guns, and they represent military hardware. These items are in the pipeline. By law money must be available when contracts are signed. Therefore, if we did not authorize the amount set out in the bill, after June 30 of this year the Mutual Security Administrator would have to cut off all future contracts. We have to make up our minds whether we are or are not going

ahead with this program. The gentleman from Ohio is not correct when he says there are \$8,000,000,000 available to the Mutual Security Agency for expenditures.

I think the House should understand just what a pipeline is. It should be stated that a pipeline is the time between obligation, or let us call it contract, and the expenditures which are made almost identical with delivery. Most goods that are represented in this pipeline take approximately 2 years to produce. So when the gentleman tells you that this \$6,000,000,000 will not be spent until a year or more from now, he is absolutely correct. But why is he correct? The money you appropriated last year is being used to pay for the goods that are coming off the assembly lines this year. When it takes 2 years to deliver a tank and approximately 2 years to deliver a plane, in order to place those orders we make the authorizations—the appropriations. Thereafter when the goods are delivered payment is made from the funds which you are authorizing today. The gentleman is incorrect when he states that there is \$8,000,000,000 left. As a matter of fact, by July 1 there would be only about \$406,000,000 left of unobligated funds.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. In commenting upon the question of lead time, the gentleman from Ohio made a very amazing remark. He outlined very clearly and indicated his complete understanding of what lead time is on these contracts for matériel. Then, he stated that under no circumstances should we give any further attention, although he is in favor of appropriations for matériel, to contracts to give us the end product in 2½ years unless, mind you, we were fully acquainted and fully informed and fully advised at this time as to what the European countries were going to do 2½ years from now.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman from Ohio says he is for the program, but he is for less of a program. Basically, what he seeks to do and asks the House to do is to make our Mutual Security Program and our tie-up with our allies so much more ineffective.

That is a problem you are faced with here when you vote on this legislation today. I think the gentleman from Ohio also failed to point out to the membership here that these programs are not only on an annual basis projected just for the current fiscal year. These programs, according to the testimony before our committee, get projected over a period of 2 to 3 years. The planning for these 50 divisions, and the planning for slices up above the 50 divisions of our allies in Europe contemplate a build-up which will continue through 1954 and 1955. All of you know, if we are going to have a program, it has to be carefully thought out and carefully planned. As a matter of fact, if we are just planning here for the next fiscal year, and worried about what we have left of the unexpended funds, we might as well fold up

and eliminate this program in its entirety. But it certainly is foolhardy to come before the House and use arguments for the next fiscal year, when actually we are planning here for the next 3 years.

The gentleman refers in his argument to various other items to indicate large sums of money available, and he quotes from page 1053 of the hearings, United States and military expenditures abroad \$1,052,000,000. He would, therefore, lead you to believe that this is money which is available in addition to what we are now authorizing today. But, quoting from the same RECORD and the same statement to which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY] refers, the concluding lines of that statement reads as follows:

These dollar earnings have been taken into account along with all other European dollar earnings before computing Europe's residual dollar needs on which the request for defense support is based.

So when we have defense support of \$1,000,000,000 plus, that is the residuum left after taking into account \$1,000,000,000 that the gentleman from Ohio says is actually available.

The gentleman from Ohio also will lead you to believe that because of the Ribicoff amendment, \$100,000,000 additional is available. If you read the bill, you will find that this section 513 B says "not more than \$100,000,000 of the funds made available under the Mutual Security Act of 1952," which indicates that that \$100,000,000 is to be taken out of the over-all sum.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. On the transfer that has been spoken of from the Defense Establishment equipment of a billion dollars, which is possible under this bill, it should be noted that transfer is actually from the Defense Department appropriated funds and is not an additional billion dollars so that if that transfer is made, our own defense funds will be that much less.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes; that is the so-called Herter amendment. I think the gentleman from Ohio has a point there that this actually could be an additional billion dollars. It might be preferable to have an amendment put in similar to the one we had last year which would provide that this \$1,000,000,000 was so allocated under this section that our own Defense Department would have the right to recapture an additional billion dollars' worth of goods from the funds that are being authorized in this bill. However, that is not what the committee voted for as it stands at the present time. There may be some logic in what the gentleman from Ohio points out on this item.

The gentleman from Ohio makes quite an argument over the question of defense support. Here I think the legislative branch is equally responsible with the executive branch because of the misunderstanding that is on the floor of the House. Year after year since these foreign-aid programs have been projected, they have been presented to the House as crises induced and short

range. They have been presented, I suppose, to make their paths smoother and easier for passage. That as soon as this bill is passed or that bill is passed we would return to a situation of normalcy. During the debates and during the reports the House itself follows through with that rationale. Consequently, we support military aid. We go along with the Marshall plan and we limit the Marshall plan to June 30, 1952. We then come along with the military-security bill, and we limit the date in 1954.

It is my personal belief that a great mistake is made by the executive branch and by the Congress of the United States when we fall for that type of argument. We get ourselves into a very difficult position, because, as the gentleman says—and I concur with him—this is basically economic aid. They found that they were hoist by their own petard, and consequently they use the term "defense support." I would say, in all truthfulness to the House, that it is not defense support in a purely military sense or it is defense support, but it means the same as economic aid. I suppose next year it will be another gimmick.

The only solution to this particular type of problem is for the House to recognize the facts of international life. The House should recognize the fact that one crisis will follow another crisis in international affairs. As long as we are the leaders of the free world, year after year there will be presented to the floor additional bills for foreign aid. We have no alternative if we are going to hold back the sweeping flood of communism all over the world. Certainly a great disservice is done to the membership of the House and to the American people when we do not tell them the truth and the reality of the world situation as it exists now.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is not the nub of the matter this: that so-called Marshall aid was economic aid, for an economic purpose—recovery—whereas this is economic aid for a military objective? It is not just recovery to enable them to resist internal subversion, but it is to build up their military strength so that they can resist external aggression.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I want to make this statement, and I do not reflect upon the sincerity or good intention of any other member of the committee. This happens to be my own personal viewpoint. My contention is that this is all a part of the same "ball of wax," to use a phrase that has been coined by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY]. I do not see how you can separate a nation's economic problems from its military problems. When this House tries to put into channels of military use only all of our aid program, we are defeating what we are actually trying to do. We are conditioning this aid with a lot of frustrations and a lot of fears.

When I was in Europe this year I tried to find out why the United States was feared. The truth is, the United States is disliked. Next to the Soviet Union

the United States is suspect. The United States is feared every place you go. Why? We talk peace and we say we are for peace, but every time we come here with an aid program, in order to get it passed, we cloak it completely with military talk. We talk about guns, we talk about tanks, we talk about airplanes, and we talk about means of destruction. What does the Soviet Union do? The Soviet Union during all this time has armed behind the iron curtain. They arm in silence. They are superior to us in almost every category, from manpower, jet planes, and tanks. But they arm always in silence. Therefore, when they send out their phony peace campaign under the symbol of the white dove, it is credible. But we here in the United States, in order to get this legislation through, put around it all this military talk and we say the House will only pass this legislation if we call it military assistance. Instead of making friends we are confusing our allies. We are making people doubt our sincerity.

I say if the time has come when the executive branch is unwilling to look at long-range plans for this Nation, then it is the duty of the Congress to exercise its responsibility. It is not enough to say that the executive branch is charged with the responsibility for foreign affairs. When this House took upon its shoulders and has approved the appropriations and authorizations in all of these bills, we are an equal partner in formulating the foreign policy of the United States of America, and therefore it is our duty to look beyond the so-called clichés and pat arguments.

I think the American people will adopt these programs, will make the sacrifices, will pay their taxes, if they know why they are being asked to do so.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Gladly.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not just as much a cliché to say that we can carry on effective military aid while at the same time we cut out what in this bill is called defense support? As the gentleman from South Carolina said, it is not enough to have men; they have got to have arms. Just the reverse is true also, it is not enough for them to have arms; they must have men who have uniforms, men who have food, men who have hope, men who have will to fight. These come from defense support, so-called.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman is absolutely correct. You cannot expect a man to fight who does not have something in his stomach, who does not have hope, who is not given something to look forward to.

Mr. JUDD. Or some knowledge that his family is secure and that he will have security and peace as a result of his efforts.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. With reference to that section of the bill known as Economic Aid, if we want these factory workers in Europe to build their own military matériel, is it not just as essential that the factory workers have fats and oils to survive and to work as it is for soldiers

in the field to have the same economic and commodity aid?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes; and I would like to point something else out to the House. Basically, I suppose all of us in considering this legislation are acting for the national interest. When you talk about just military aid I think the House must realize that over a period of years, and certainly since the end of the war, our exports have exceeded our imports in a sum averaging \$5,000,000,000 a year. These people in order to buy the substance of our farms, and the substance of our mines and the substance of our industry have to have dollars. Where are they going to get them? They are going to get them in two ways: One, if we import goods from Europe so they can earn dollars; and if we do not then we give them the money the way we are doing it here. And let us be very, very candid with the American people and say what we are doing in legislation such as this.

These happen to be the facts of life. Now about this so-called technical assistance. It should be realized that there is a revolution in all of Asia and Africa today. It all has not been Soviet-induced. Sure, the Communists have fanned the blaze wherever there was a blaze. They are organized enough so that where a nation has a weak government and cannot cope with its economic problems the Communists come in and set up an organized minority ready to go, ready to take over the government.

Here we are in America with 155,000,000 people and 6 percent of the world's surface. The Communists have under their control 800,000,000 people and 25 percent of the world's surface. I say to you it is important to have allies, that we need allies for the United States of America.

A bill such as this is for the national interest of the United States. A bill such as this says to the people of the world: "You are our allies. You are our friends. You people are with us." What we in the United States must recognize in this great international contest is that if we are going to continue successful we must make sure that the United States is not out-manuevered and out-powered by the Soviet Union.

We need a bill such as this. We need this authorization to make sure that America stays a going concern with its ideals and principles to posterity.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, the Mutual Security Act is for the purpose of increasing the security of the United States by helping the members of the free world to strengthen themselves in the current struggle against the militant and aggressive policies of the Soviet Union. The report of the committee on H. R. 7005 states on page 7:

The justification for continuing substantial United States expenditures for foreign assistance is the maintenance of the security of the United States. In determining how much to spend and the way such expenditures should be made, an appraisal of the current danger from Soviet aggression is essential.

There has been no decrease in the danger of Soviet aggression. The United States must not relax in its defense efforts and our one hope for the avoidance of an all-out war is in becoming so strong that the potential enemy will not dare to launch an attack upon us. The fundamental principle of the Mutual Security Act is to augment the strength of the free world. This can be accomplished through our aid and by the self-help and the cooperation of the recipient nations. Our investment in foreign affairs is exceedingly high and in continuing to make available assistance, it is imperative to have assurance that all possible efforts will be exercised by those who are receiving our aid to strengthen themselves as rapidly as possible.

We are engaged in a world-wide struggle for survival. The unstable international situation is the result of the unwillingness and the absolute refusal of the Soviet Union to cooperate in establishing a peaceful and stable international society. The Kremlin in its vicious policies of expansion and domination is seeking to tyrannize the earth. It is necessary, therefore, for the free world to gird itself to meet this growing danger, and to protect ourselves from being overrun by aggressive militant international communism. Our trouble today is a direct result of the policies of the Kremlin. We are in the process of strengthening ourselves and strengthening our allies to meet this growing danger.

FOREIGN AID GIVEN BY THE UNITED STATES

In the summary of foreign aid by the United States prepared for the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the Clearing Office for Foreign Transactions, Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, we find that the net foreign aid in the war and postwar periods amounts to \$73,687,000,000. During the postwar period—July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1951—a total of \$32,716,000,000 was expended in net foreign aid. For the current fiscal year the Congress appropriated \$7,328,903,976. We are now considering H. R. 7005 which provides for an authorization of \$6,901,100,000.

The giving of so much assistance by one country to others is unique in world history. During the last few years we have expended over \$4,000,000,000 in Germany alone. Never before has a victorious nation spent so much money in assisting a defeated power. This huge spending in the postwar years represents great sacrifices and the pouring out of the resources of our people. Since the only way this money can be raised is by taxation, every citizen in the land is directly affected by this vast investment in foreign aid. Matters of foreign policy have become of vital interest to every person in the country.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

H. R. 7005, the Mutual Security Act for 1952, the bill under consideration, provides for a total authorization of \$6,901,100,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953. The difference between the executive request and the recommendations of the Committee is \$998,900,000.

The committee reduced the request of \$7,900,000,000 by \$1,010,900,000, and then added \$12,000,000 for the children's fund. Thus, we arrive at a total reduction of \$998,900,000.

TITLE I

Title I of this measure provides \$3,316,000,000 in military assistance for Western Europe. The balances of prior appropriations unobligated on June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation will continue available. The funds carried over may be used for original purposes. The subsequent authorization sections of the measure contain carry-over provisions. The original request for military aid under title I which covers Western Europe was \$4,145,000,000. Here the committee made a cut of \$829,000,000, or 20 percent.

The Executive requested \$1,819,200,000 for defense support in Europe including Greece and Turkey and for economic assistance to Austria and Trieste. The committee cut this item by 10 percent, leaving \$1,637,300,000.

Under section 3 of this title, Spain will receive not less than \$25,000,000 of the above newly authorized funds, as well as a carry-over of unexpended balances from the appropriation of last year. This is for economic, technical, and military assistance.

TITLE II

Under title II, Greece, Turkey, and Iran—subject to section 202 of the Mutual Security Act—and other countries of the Near East and Africa will receive \$606,370,000 in military assistance. Also the Near East and Africa are to receive \$55,000,000 in economic and technical aid.

Included in title II is \$65,000,000 for UN Palestine refugee relief. Also set aside is \$76,000,000 for immigration into Israel. If the funds authorized for these two items cannot be used, the President may spend the money in other sections of the Near East and Africa.

TITLE III

Title III provides \$611,230,000 for military and other assistance to countries in Asia and the Pacific. It also makes available \$408,000,000 for economic and technical assistance to the nations in this area.

Forty-five million dollars authorized last year for the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency is to continue available for authorization under this bill. The unexpended balances of funds from earlier appropriations are also made available. The Department of the Army is authorized to turn over up to \$67,500,000 worth of goods and services which may be charged against the United States pledge to UNKRA when the President determines such a contribution should be made. It should be emphasized that this is not new money, but represents Army money with respect to goods already in its pipeline.

TITLE IV

Latin America will receive \$62,400,000 in military assistance under this title. Twenty-two million dollars in technical assistance is set aside for Latin America including non-self-governing territories in the Western Hemisphere all coming

under the Act for International Development.

TITLE V

Under title V, \$10,000,000 is set aside for the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for Movement of Migrants from Europe—PICMME.

Two million eight hundred thousand dollars is provided for ocean-freight charges to carry out the relief-package subsidy program.

Seventeen million dollars is for multilateral technical cooperation, \$16,000,000 of which is for U. N. and \$1,000,000 for the Organization of American States.

A sum not to exceed \$12,000,000 is provided for the U. N. International Children's Emergency Fund between the passage of the bill and December 31, 1953.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee decided that \$100,000,000 of the funds provided under this act may be supplied without conditions, with not more than \$20,000,000 going to any one country.

The Secretary of Defense may furnish without reimbursement military assistance up to \$1,000,000,000 out of Defense appropriations for materials of war. This is not new money. Under this provision, Defense Department equipment is transferable to countries in the mutual-defense program.

The act also provides that not less than \$1,000,000,000 of military-assistance funds be expended for procurement of military end items from sources outside the United States. This is not additional money, but comes out of mutual-security military-assistance funds. This is the section that provides for offshore procurement.

The act stipulates that the director of this program is permitted to provide military and defense support and, in case of defense support, to furnish funds to NATO, the Schuman-plan organization, and the European defense community, if and when such a community is established.

Within 90 days of the enactment of this bill, the total number of United States citizens working on the program must be reduced at least 10 percent below the January 1, 1952, figure. It is estimated that over 1,000 employees will be affected.

The eligibility section of the Mutual Security Act of last year is amended by setting up further conditions. The Director is empowered to take suitable or appropriate steps to assure effective use by recipients of their resources, including fiscal and budgetary, for mutual security. The Director, in granting assistance, must take into account the progress made by recipient nations. This provision is fine, but I believe it does not go far enough and at the proper time I propose to offer an amendment to strengthen the entire section on eligibility.

The Director is authorized to initiate projects and assist in procuring and stimulating production of materials in short supply among the recipient nations. The purpose of this section is to reduce the drain on the resources of the United States.

The recipient nations must furnish the United States with counterpart funds to be used for purchasing materials in which the United States is deficient.

In carrying out the Mutual Security Act the Director must conduct a study on impediments to private investment abroad and must broaden the guaranty criteria. TCA is required to grant more private contracts to industrial firms. The Department of State is required to accelerate its treaty program relative to private investment abroad.

The equivalent of \$100,000,000 in counterpart funds must be used exclusively in stimulating the development of private enterprise.

Investment and informational media guaranties will continue after June 30, 1952.

Up to \$100,000,000 worth of defense support, economic and technical assistance funds may be used for subscription to the capital of the International Finance Corporation if such a corporation is created as an affiliate of the International Bank.

This in summary gives the principal proposed authorizations of H. R. 7005. I have also presented the general provisions of the Mutual Security Act. I believe the act can be improved by a further reduction in the authorizations and by the addition of a stronger section setting forth reasonable and precise conditions to accompany American aid.

FURTHER REDUCTIONS

In my opinion the proposed authorizations may be reduced still further without impairing the effectiveness of the mutual-security program. It is my belief that approximately \$500,000,000 more could be taken from the several titles without doing harm to the mutual-security enterprise which we have undertaken. I have a feeling that this will help the program because such action would tend to require greater cooperative efforts and more self-help.

The United States is carrying a tremendously heavy burden in defense and foreign aid. During the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 we were spending for defense 13.7 percent of our gross national product. This percentage is far above our allies, the next being France at 9.8 percent. Furthermore, 2.2 percent of our population, or 3,465,000, are in the armed services. This is in excess of any other country, the closest being Belgium-Luxemburg with 1.5 percent. True, the United States is making available aid in terms of its own security, but our country is carrying an exceedingly heavy share, and if a substantial saving can be made without impairing our own security or the security of any other member of the free world, then it is our duty to effect the necessary reductions.

The committee, in considering the bill now before the House, made all of its cuts in title I. Title I provides military aid and defense support for Western Europe. The Executive request for military aid under this title was \$4,145,000,000. The committee cut this by \$829,000,000. The Executive figure for defense support under title I was \$1,819,200,000. This was reduced by \$181,900,000. The military aid and the economic and tech-

nical assistance in titles II, III, and IV were not reduced. It would seem to me that we could wisely make a further reduction in the proposed military authorization of title I and at the same time effect a percentage reduction in the authorizations proposed by the other titles.

MILITARY AUTHORIZATIONS

Seventy percent of the military funds provided in this bill are in title I. The measure proposes an authorization of \$3,316,000. Since this part of the program is the largest, it is subject to the closest scrutiny in proposing additional reductions.

In the first place, we should keep clearly in mind that the total military assistance appropriated since the beginning of the mutual-security program is \$11,802,500,000. Of this sum \$7,894,300,000 will still be unexpended at the termination of the present fiscal year, June 30, 1952. During the fiscal year 1953 it is estimated that military expenditures will amount to \$7,714,000,000. This means the carry-over at the inception of fiscal 1953 will exceed the estimated expenditures for that year. Furthermore, it is estimated that the unexpended balance on June 30, 1952, would be \$5,458,000,000 if the entire program is adopted.

There is nothing unusual in the above procedure since contracts can be signed only after funds have been appropriated. It takes a period of time to manufacture the end items. It requires nearly 2 years to construct an airplane after the order has been placed. It should, however, be made perfectly clear that a large part of the military money in this bill upon which we are now acting will have no effect upon deliveries in 1953. A major portion of the funds will result in deliveries during 1954 and later. Therefore, it is well to consider carefully the military provisions in this measure, since the effect of the authorization will be felt far in the future.

In reference to 1954 and thereafter, the Congress does not know, and no one else knows, exactly how many tanks, airplanes, and guns we will need to send to Europe. Europe is moving toward some degree of economic unification under the Schuman plan, and toward some degree of military unification under the plan now being considered for the creation of a European army. The contractual agreements with Germany have yet to be completed. All of this adds up to considerable uncertainty concerning the future course that European history is to take.

It is agreed by statesmen both in the Old and the New World that only by economic, military, and political unification will the Continent be able to stand on its own feet, and only by such unification will it be possible to develop sufficient strength for the protection of Europe. If progress toward unity becomes more rapid in 1953, it may well be that the production of defense materials in Europe will so increase that it will be unnecessary for us to continue to furnish large quantities of end items.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I have such a high regard for my distinguished friend from New Hampshire on this subject that I hope I misunderstand him. The gentleman, of course, is aware that an agreement has been made for a definite number of divisions, battalions of armored troops, and wings of fighter and bomber planes for the various signatory nations. The gentleman is aware that the proper authorities on matériel estimate how much it costs to get the light-tank battalions, the heavy-tank battalions, the fighter wings, and the various component parts. This course of authorization, to be supplemented by a budgetary appropriation, is predicated solely and entirely upon that military chart and that military estimate, per unit and per nation. The gentleman is not suggesting that because those forces are not in being other than by estimate you should not authorize now necessary funds to be appropriated and allocated if and when they are born? Certainly the gentleman does not mean that.

Mr. MERROW. I would say to the gentleman that as far as I have been able to learn the military plans are firm through fiscal 1953, and the major part of these proposed authorizations will not have their effect until 1954 and 1955.

Mr. FLOOD. No doubt about that.

Mr. MERROW. Fiscal 1953 will not be affected by any military reductions that may be made.

Mr. FLOOD. No question about that.

Mr. MERROW. As far as the military plans and as far as the program is concerned for 1954, beginning in fiscal 1954, and thereafter, there is such a degree of uncertainty that I believe for two reasons we can well cut the authorizations. In the first place, there is a great deal of political uncertainty in Europe, and when we get back here next year the Congress will have an opportunity to look at the program again. In the second place, there is a provision in this bill that in the event of an emergency there can be a transfer of a billion dollars worth of end items from our own defense. Therefore, if we decrease the military authorizations, it will be an indication to Europe that we expect them to step up their own military production, and then in a few months when the situation becomes clearer as to the economic unification and the military unification of Europe, we can take another look at the program.

Mr. FLOOD. Then, of course, the gentleman means, and that is what amazes me because of my high regard for his understanding of this problem, what the gentleman just said in reply to my interrogation is this, that by this action of further reduction, you are reducing what you want these other nations to do in direct ratio to the cut that you are now making further in this bill. You are blowing hot and cold. You cannot do both.

Mr. MERROW. I am not reducing what I want the other nations to do.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, that is what it means.

Mr. MERROW. I would like to see the other nations produce more end

items so that the time will come when we will not have to be supplying them. Furthermore, if this program went through at the beginning of fiscal year 1954, which is nearly 2 years away, we would still have an unexpended balance of about \$5,000,000,000. That is programming exceedingly far into the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I will yield briefly, I would like to make another point, and I am sorry I do not have too much time.

Mr. FLOOD. I am in complete agreement with that analysis because it cannot be refuted. The point I make is that you are now saying to the military planners for the Nation, who you are insisting should plan further, that you will not permit them to make the plans that you have asked them thus far and agreed that they make. You are now cutting them \$500,000,000 in Europe. Is that not so, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. MERROW. No, this is not what I propose. I am asking for a cut in the entire bill of \$500,000,000.

Mr. FLOOD. I referred only to the military part of it at this point.

Mr. MERROW. Yes, I was talking about the military. Now, if I have time, I would talk about the rest of it. But, what I am saying is that we can make a further cut in the military authorization in title I, which will not interfere with the effectiveness of the program because the plans for 1954 and 1955 and thereafter are not firm. There is no doubt of that.

Europe should realize that somehow the problems in connection with developing unified efforts must be solved since the United States cannot continue economic and military aid indefinitely. In view of the great uncertainty in 1954 and in 1955, it is exceedingly difficult to forecast what will be needed and by authorizing great sums of money which will not effect deliveries until 1954 and 1955, it could be said that we are actually making available huge sums before plans are fully crystallized.

The program presented to the committee is for fiscal 1953 and not 1954. True, we know what the Lisbon commitments are. These commitments are for 1953 not 1954. We are being asked to vote money to be spent in 1954 in consideration of commitments as to what the countries who get the money will do in 1953. There is no definite program for 1954 and thereafter.

CUT IN MILITARY WILL NOT ENDANGER PROGRAM

It may be argued that if we do not appropriate all the funds requested at the present time, to that extent we will interfere with future deliveries of planes, tanks, and other items under the mutual security program for 1954 and 1955. However, under the prevailing circumstances, it does not seem to me that this is a strong argument for not reducing the military expenditures in this measure. In the first place, our domestic defense program is sufficiently large to

keep our factories in operation until we see what Europe actually requires in 1954 and thereafter. It is my hope, and I am sure it is the hope of everyone interested in this program, that the nations on the Continent will soon be in a position to manufacture their own defense equipment, thereby saving the American taxpayers billions of dollars.

The measure we are now considering authorizes a transfer from United States production up to \$1,000,000,000 if in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense an emergency should develop. In this connection let me make it perfectly clear that even though we have reduced the executive request for foreign aid in this measure by \$1,010,900,000, we have by the transfer provision given permission to take \$1,000,000,000 worth of defense items from our own defense production for mutual security countries. We have saved \$1,010,900,000, but technically we have reduced the amount available for foreign aid by only \$10,900,000.

The Congress will be in session next year and if it is then clear that in the interest of national security there must be further foreign aid to provide for deliveries in 1954 and thereafter, we can take another look at the mutual security program.

I am convinced that in making additional cuts we will not hurt this program, but on the contrary it will be strengthened for two important reasons—reductions in expenditures will improve the position of our own economy and such cuts will be an indication to the recipients of our aid that we expect an acceleration of effort in order that they may become increasingly more self-sufficient.

DEFENSE SUPPORT

The original request for defense support in this bill has been reduced by 10 percent. The defense support, included in title I, is for the original NATO countries plus Greece and Turkey, now a part of NATO. Defense support has a direct relationship to military production. It is axiomatic that a strong European economy, individually and collectively, is the foundation for an adequate defense. It can be argued that insofar as the economy suffers to that extent will defense production be retarded.

It is estimated that for fiscal 1953 the defense expenditures of eight European NATO countries and Germany would be \$13,949,000,000 with defense support, but without defense support the military production would fall to \$10,620,000,000. I realize that all of us are anxious to end economic assistance, but to be perfectly realistic economic and defense support is a vital part of the total European defense effort. We have succeeded in strengthening the economies of the several European countries. We would like to see much greater progress in their collective efforts to create a sound continental economy. It seems to me that the committee action in not reducing defense support by a greater percentage is sound policy.

COMMITTEE REPORT ON ECONOMIC PROGRAM

In connection with the economic program the committee report has some very pertinent paragraphs which are

well worth our consideration. Commenting on the \$1,637,300,000 authorization by this measure are these words; on page 46:

These funds are to be spent for the imports which the countries of Europe require in order to carry out their military commitments.

Europe is a great workshop possessing highly developed manufacturing plants together with skilled workmen and a highly developed technology. Normally the industries of Europe concentrate on producing for export in order to pay for the imported raw materials and foodstuffs which are obtainable in other areas of the world.

It is essential to the defense program that the industries of Europe be converted to military production. The industries of the United States do not have the capacity to produce all of the equipment required by European forces in addition to that required by our own troops. Furthermore, it is essential that Europe produce for itself so as to relieve the United States of financing as much of the European defense program as possible.

Europe finds itself with little surplus manufacturing capacity to put into military production while leaving normal production for export undisturbed. The European countries were just reaching the point where they could finance their own imports as a result of the Marshall plan. They should and have tightened their belts, but the only way they can produce airplanes, tanks, and weapons is to curtail their production of machinery, automobiles, and electronic equipment for export.

The people of Europe who work in the factories which turn out military end items have to eat imported food and wear clothing made from imported cotton in just the same way they would if they were engaged in export production. The difference is that exports have to pay for the food and clothing required.

As a consequence, the countries of Europe face this dilemma: If they convert from production for export to production for defense without outside help, they cannot feed and clothe their people. These countries are already so much in debt that borrowing is impossible. Their reserves are at the minimum limit. If they do not get United States assistance to pay for necessary imports, they will have to reconvert to export production to keep going.

This is no reflection on the patriotism of the people of Europe or their determination to resist aggression. They must export or die. We do not want their military production to be merely a byproduct of their export production. We face an emergency, and it is in the interest of the United States that they use all possible facilities for the production of arms and military equipment.

The defense-support program has been worked out specifically to meet this situation. The amount of assistance planned for each country has been adjusted to the amount necessary to permit it to do its defense job after taking into account its capacity for military production and making sure that each has tightened its belt to the limit. As a further assurance on this latter point the committee has recommended a 10-percent cut of the defense-support item.

An important part of the defense-support funds will be used to pay for raw materials and machinery used directly by the factories producing military end items in Europe. It would be futile, however, to limit the use of United States funds to such purposes. Each country has more dollars derived from its own exports to spend for imports than the dollars it receives in the form of grants from the United States. Consequently, if it was provided that defense-support money should be used only for copper, machinery, and items going directly to arms factories, the re-

ipient countries would merely buy less of these items with their earned dollars and divert the dollars thus saved to the procurements of wheat and cotton.

It is important that Europe build up her military production as rapidly as possible. After the armies have been supplied, it may not be necessary to keep the military production on such a high level. By adding to the capacity of the European productive system, the time will come when the Continent can manufacture both for defense and for export. Then defense support will be unnecessary.

We have already made a 10-percent cut in defense support. By continuing defense support we will help produce the required expansion of European industry. If industry expands, the need for economic assistance will certainly decrease. We must work toward the end of American foreign aid, but for the present time it would seem to me that too great a cut in defense support would gravely hamper European military production and could well tend to defeat the objectives which we have in mind.

TITLES II, III, AND IV

I would suggest at least a 10 percent cut in these titles, both economic and military. All the reductions should not be made in the first title of this bill. A 10 percent cut in the other titles would amount to a saving of \$190,600,000.

The military programs in Greece, Turkey, Formosa, and Indochina are well organized. They are not subject to organizational uncertainties such as exist in Europe. A comparable heavy cut in these areas would not be warranted. The economic and technical assistance in these countries is chiefly devoted to assisting undeveloped nations where there is considerable political unrest.

A 10 percent cut will not retard the program and, furthermore, since we expect these countries to help themselves, it could well have a most salutary effect in bringing about an increase in their efforts. After all is said and done, a rise in the standard of living in undeveloped areas is largely dependent upon the efforts of the local populations.

The United States cannot continue indefinitely to spend its resources in all sections of the world. Billions upon billions have already been expended in foreign aid. It is time that the entire program be given the most careful scrutiny and that all those we are helping do their utmost to assist themselves. The Treasury of this country is not inexhaustible and any saving we can make in this program will strengthen our own economy which in turn means strength for the free world.

In the countries outside of NATO we have two programs—mutual security program and TCA. The economic aid given under the Mutual Security Act must be justified in terms of its military effectiveness. The technical assistance programs are for the implementation of point 4 and are designed to increase the standard of living. There is a grave question as to how much development is actually taking place in backward areas and until we are more certain of results and of the accomplishments of both the mutual-security program and the TCA

program, it is well for us to be somewhat cautious in the spending of American funds. A 10 percent reduction in these titles will amount to a saving of nearly \$200,000,000 and will not, in my opinion, impair the program.

NEED FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

I have consistently supported foreign aid, both economic and military. It is my sincere belief that in the interest of United States security it is imperative for us to assist our allies in this struggle against international communism which is supported by the militant and aggressive policies of the Soviet Union. I am convinced that proper reductions and the insistence upon certain reasonable and precise conditions will strengthen this joint effort. In making available foreign aid we must keep constantly in mind our own capacities and the capacities of our allies in helping themselves and in giving greater cooperation in the achievement of mutual defense. The United States is ready and willing to do everything in its power by way of leadership and by extending help to increase not only its own strength but the strength of its allies as we gird for the greatest contest which free men have ever faced in history.

Our problems must be faced with courage, determination, and statesmanship, constantly keeping foremost in our minds that upon the soundness of our own fiscal condition depends the future existence of the free world and upon the strength of our economy depends the outcome of the life-and-death struggle for survival against the destructive and sinister forces of international communism led and inspired by the Soviet Union.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the mutual-security bill now before the House. To me it is a part, and an important part, of our national defense. It is mutual security, and I stress those words, that strengthens both ourselves and our friends in the face of Soviet imperialism.

Because I favor this principle does not mean that I cast my vote without adequate evidence to support this measure. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, sat for more than 6 weeks every day, sometimes twice a day, to hear witnesses. More than 40 witnesses testified. Each of them was subjected to a thorough examination by the members. We asked for an analysis of the present world situation—area by area, country by country. We requested a justification for every item that appears in this bill. We heard military, political, and economic experts. The printed hearings on this bill cover more than 1,100 pages. In addition, several hundred pages contain highly classified information. I mention these details only to show that we have conscientiously discharged the responsibilities this House has placed upon us. When it came time to mark up this bill, no one who followed the testimony could plead a lack of information. I am convinced that the committee has strengthened the original bill. I can support it without reservation.

What are the bases of the mutual-security program? As I see it, they are really four in number:

First. The security of the United States is part of the security of the free world. The United States cannot achieve lasting security by its efforts alone. It must act in concert with other free nations. The United States relies on other nations for resources necessary to its own security. Economic and military power of the free world together is far greater than of the United States alone.

Second. The objective of the United States is to build strength in the free world, both as a deterrent to Communist aggression and as a positive force for the fulfillment of the aspirations of free peoples. This means the building of the free world with enough military strength to deter external Communist aggression and the building of economic, political, and moral strength sufficient to remove threats of Communist subversion and point the way to progress so urgently desired by many people. These forms of strength are indivisible. Military strength alone cannot do the job. Economic, political, or moral strength alone cannot do the job. Together they provide the means to withstand Communist aggression and to provide the hope that gives the will to resist and the faith in free institutions.

Third. The mutual security program for the coming year is necessary if the common effort is to be successful. If we are to expect others to devote their resources to the task at hand, we must be prepared to devote our own resources in appropriate measures.

Fourth. The United States can afford the Mutual Security Program. The costs involved, I am convinced, are within the economic capacity of the United States. The cost is a part of the security program of the United States, which is a legitimate first charge upon our resources. Most of the money in this bill is for the advancement of the program in Europe. The Members may properly ask what our goals in Europe are. As I see it, our major goal in Europe is to provide a military build-up as rapidly as possible through a total defense effort, military and economic. Our allies of the North Atlantic Community and ourselves met in Lisbon to determine what the goals for the current year should be and the projecting of forces in 1953 and 1954. The plan worked out at Lisbon calls for a combined defense effort of all the NATO countries during this year. It will provide the following forces: 50 divisions, about half of which are to be in a state of combat readiness, and the balance in rapidly mobilizable reserve units; 4,000 combat aircraft, together with necessary airfields, supporting installations and communications systems; 700 major combat vessels, and 925 smaller types of vessels. I would remind the Members that these sizable numbers do not include the forces of Greece and Turkey, now members of NATO. The forces of those countries will be integrated into NATO defense planning to perform their proper roles.

What will the United States contribute to the European defense build-up in this next fiscal year? An examination

of this bill reveals that our contributions to Europe will take four principal forms: military end items produced in the United States; military end items procured in Europe under the offshore procurement program; military training and technical program; and defense support assistance to European economies, such as commodities, machinery, raw materials.

This last form of contribution, defense support, is a matter of some confusion to many people. Defense support takes the form of raw materials, equipment, and commodities which Europe must import in order to expand its production to the extent necessary to sustain the desired level of military effort. Some people argue that defense support is just another name for the Marshall plan. The increased production under the Marshall plan went mostly to expand civilian consumption and investment. The increased production under the Mutual Security Program goes mostly to expand European defense programs. It is the difference in the end result of the two programs that explains the difference in the names. In the analyses presented to our committee it was made clear that the more than \$1,000,000,000 defense support spent in Europe would enable those countries to increase their military contributions by about \$3,500,000,000. To me this looks like a good investment.

The emphasis that we are giving to Europe in this program is not at the expense of Asia, the Near East, or Latin America. These countries, particularly in Asia, are also under Communist threat. The free nations of that area are holding the line against aggression in Korea and Indochina. They are battling Communist-inspired disorders in Burma, Malaya, and the Philippines. The loss of any of these countries would mean the loss of freedom for millions of people, the loss of vital raw materials, the loss of points of critical strategic importance to the world. Much of the money contained in this bill will be devoted to strengthening those areas.

At the same time that we are giving assistance in the military field we are also giving economic and technical assistance to help friendly countries in building the kind of strength that comes through finding solutions to problems of disease, illiteracy, inadequate food, and economic underdevelopment. These conditions would exist even if there were no Soviet threat to peace, but militant Soviet communism exploits the turbulence in these areas. Positive measures and speed are necessary. In the Near East our programs are designed to assist responsible leaders, orderly reforms, and development in which the energies of the people can find constructive expansion. We are assisting the countries of Asia to establish strong and stable governments. In Latin America we are assisting countries to raise living standards and overcome the weaknesses of their economic structure that contribute to political and economic instability. We are doing these things by providing assistance where the need is urgent, by providing trained people to work with the people in those countries at the grass-roots levels. This

is where action can be effective, where "know-how" and "show-how" attack urgent problems at their sources. The funds for these types of assistance are relatively small compared with the European defense program, but the importance of what must be done and what can be done is not comparable in dollar amounts. The effect is what counts. The programs of these areas are tailored to the needs, the priority of the problem, and to the most effective method of getting at it.

If we do not support this program, we then have to consider alternatives to it. One choice is to withdraw to our own shores and gamble our national safety on air and naval power. A glance at some of the vital materials that go into our air and naval power shows how self-defeating this would be. Manganese, tin, and chrome, all essential to our own military effort, come from outside the Western Hemisphere. Should we turn our backs on the rest of the world, these and other precious resources so vital to our own security would not only be lost to us but, what is more important, would probably be added to the military strength of the Soviet empire. Without our friends abroad the threat of aggression would move close to our own shores.

Another choice is to limit this program to the provision of finished military equipment made in this country. This would mean that the relatively small sum marked for defense support would be eliminated. This is the most expensive choice and the one least calculated to bring lasting military strength. A military force could be built on equipment from the United States but—and this point is most important—this means that the United States must continue to support and maintain its own Military Establishment plus a military establishment of the European countries. Defense support is the most economical in terms of the end results.

Still another choice that lies before us is to limit our assistance to a combination of military end items and the necessary support to develop and maintain them. But arms alone do not satisfy the aspirations of people whose demands for change bring economic, political, and social insecurity. To focus our efforts on military-assistance programs alone is to invite the dangerous risk of undermining the bases upon which security rests.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I am convinced that the bill before us points the direction and gives the emphasis to the type of assistance we can best afford to give and which our friends can best afford to use. I urge the Members to vote favorably on this bill.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, as a junior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I hitherto thought it wise to get my bearings before attempting to speak on international questions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman may term himself a junior member, but I consider him to be one of the most

valuable members in the committee as well as in the House.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that very much. I might say in that connection that when I first joined the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it was very near the end of the last session, and I sat in with a great deal of interest. But, to tell the truth, I was terribly confused. I knew very little about foreign affairs, and I still do. There were so many alphabetical agencies referred to, that one afternoon I was just so confused, and my head was turning so that I got up and walked out and got some fresh air for a while. But I am beginning to acclimate myself now to thinking in these terms, though I have not yet gotten any striped pants. I understand that after a year or so that will come too. It is unfortunate that our genial chairman lost his pants in Europe several years ago, although I do not think they were striped pants. Even if he did lose his pants, he retained his sense of humor, which carries him over many rough places as he presides over the committee.

Mr. Chairman, to be serious again, I want to say I do approve of the way that this debate has been conducted so far today. It has really been on a high plane. I have been especially impressed with the splendid speech made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. I just wish we had more men in public life who had the same confidence in the sanity and sound judgment of the American people, and who are willing, as Mr. RIBICOFF is, to tell them the facts of life and not try to sugar-coat this bill of foreign aid.

I have confidence in the American people, and I am sure that if we tell them the facts they will respond and they will pay for this insurance policy, to which the able chairman of our committee has likened this program.

I am still a learner, but no longer a freshman. Even now, I would be holding my tongue if I did not believe that this House is confronted with an extraordinarily crucial decision at one of the tensest moments in human history.

It is my belief that the next 60 to 90 days will determine whether or not we have a united Europe and whether or not we can weld together or mold into a defense community the countries of Western Europe. General Eisenhower has done a tremendous job in Europe and we are just upon the verge of getting unity of the defense community of the Western World. Russia realizes that, and Russia is more disturbed about the prospects of our success in Europe than she is about any other thing that is happening today. Consequently, she has made misleading peace proposals, and has proposed a unification of Germany. That is done for no other purpose than to interfere with the unification of the Western World, and the strengthening and building of a strong defense community. People in Germany are beginning to waver. If we waver now and if we do not face up to the realities of life, to the facts of life and to our obligations, then I do not know whether Adenauer in Germany, Pinay

in France, and Schuman will be able to weld this community together and make an effective defense community of Western Europe. These are critical days—the next 30 days. That defense pact must be signed with Germany, and if we weaken now and say that we do not consider the situation in Western Europe and in the world serious enough to do what is necessary to furnish arms to the men who are ready in Europe to serve in this European army, and to furnish economic aid, if you want to call it that, to Europe, because, as the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, has said, while this may be economic aid, it is economic aid with a military purpose—our failure may defeat our efforts to build a strong European defense community—we must not falter now.

The issue before us should not be dealt with on a partisan basis. The democratic process calls for debate. It thrives on differences of opinion. But debate on foreign policy should be on the highest level we can reach. What we do here about this appropriation for mutual aid involves the fate of the free world. We are legislating now for the benefit or the hurt of untold generations to come.

The situation, as I see it, boils down to this. The world is suffering from a terrible disease. All the doctors we have called in are agreed on the remedy. But the prescription is very expensive. In a case of life and death, do we talk about economy, or stop to haggle with the druggist or doctor about their charges? Of course not.

In its report on H. R. 7005, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended a reduction of \$1,010,000,000 in the amount proposed by the President. With some misgivings, I joined in that action. I am not at all sure that a larger sum would not have been preferable. General Eisenhower has said that a cut of a billion would be "heavily and seriously felt." General Eisenhower has done a remarkable job in Europe and I am ready to take his word when he talks about our security problem in Europe. Frankly, I do not like the idea of a "heavy and seriously felt" cut in funds to be spent for maintaining the security of the United States.

But I was willing to go along with the rest of the committee, and I am willing to stand by the decision we reached. In my opinion, however, any effort to reduce the figure set by the committee would be deplorable. Again I accept General Eisenhower's judgment. He said a further substantial cut would endanger the whole NATO military program "essential in the interest of United States security."

I say the issue is not one of economy, but of fundamental American policy and the security of the free world. I am as eager as the next man to keep down costs and taxes. I am not unaware that this is an election year, and that economy is supposed to work some sort of magic where voters are concerned. But there is a true and false economy, and I make bold to assert that using a meat ax on the foreign aid program is not true economy.

To use the meat ax on the foreign-aid program is not true economy.

And may I say that in the consideration of the bill by the Foreign Affairs Committee in making the cuts that we did make, we did not use the meat-ax technique; as a matter of fact, each section of the bill was carefully gone over, and the cuts were made where it was believed they would do the least damage to the program.

Right here I want to pay a tribute to our chairman and to the members of the committee who have worked so hard, both on the majority side and the minority side. There have been differences of opinion; there are still differences of opinion. The gentleman from New Hampshire, and I have the highest regard for him, believes that another \$500,000,000 can be cut from the program. I differ with him; I think it would seriously hurt the program if we should.

Old Sam Johnson said that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." He meant "patriotizing," of course. I will not say penny pinching is in the same class. But I will say that sometimes it seems to me that shouting economy is the first resort of a politician.

For what are the facts? The fact is that all the extraordinary expenditures of recent years have not harmed our national economy. The fact is that, while there has been some dislocation, and we have felt some inflationary pressures, our industrial capacity has been expanding tremendously. Nineteen hundred and fifty to 1951, security outlays rose by \$16,000,000,000, but our total output rose by \$26,000,000,000. Economists tell us that our total output will grow by roughly 5 percent annually in the next 2 years. That would make our gross national output approximately \$345,000,000,000 in 1952 and \$363,000,000,000 in 1953.

A little press story in the Washington Post for yesterday, May 19, quoted statistics from the Department of Commerce to the effect that, based on the output of the first quarter the total value of the national output would be for 1952 \$339,500,000,000. Compare that with \$273,000,000,000 in 1947, and \$326,000,000,000 in 1951, and you have assurance doubly sure that the economic health of the Nation is in no danger by reason of the money we are spending to build up the military and economic strength of the free world.

I saw somewhere today the statement that the money we are spending in foreign aid is a blue chip investment in national security. I say that states the proposition as clearly as it can be stated.

I repeat the issue is not one of sound husbandry of our resources, but of fundamental foreign policy to protect those resources.

Nobody admits being an isolationist these days, but I observe that only a change of tactics has taken place. The man who used to shout against "entangling alliances" today shows he is still unconverted by working against our wholehearted, full-handed participation in world affairs.

It took us about 2 years after the German surrender to realize that Russia was

trying to wreck the rest of the world in order to communize it. Having found that out, we proceeded to meet this challenge. It was plain that if we were to halt Soviet aggression, we would have to help other countries threatened by this aggression.

So in March 1947 President Truman, calling for aid to Greece and Turkey, announced the doctrine which bears his name, that is, the doctrine that we would "support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure." As a result, Greece and Turkey are today members of NATO, standing shoulder to shoulder with other free countries in a preventive campaign against Soviet imperialism. Ask our top military men in Korea about their fighting qualities. They have been superb.

Then, 3 months later, came General Marshall's proposal calling for a gigantic program for the economic rebuilding of all Europe on a cooperative basis made possible by funds from this country. In 1948, the European recovery plan became a working fact. The result has been all that we expected. By planning together, and by making their contributions to the main account, the democracies of Western Europe regained much of the economic ground they had lost. If Korea had not intervened, it is admitted that their economies would now be on a sound basis. But the strain put upon the nations of Western Europe by the necessity for rearmament was too much for their economies to stand.

So on March 15, 1947, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed, with the United States joining other nations on the proposition that "armed attack against one or more" would be "considered an attack against them all." In September 1949, Congress passed the Mutual Defense Assistance Act appropriating \$1,000,000,000 for military aid to the North Atlantic Treaty countries.

What we are dealing with now is a sequel to that action. Since 1949, NATO has welded the European nations together, and one of its projects, the European Defense Community, is to have a supranational army, including German soldiers. It is as Supreme Commander of NATO forces that General Eisenhower has warned us against being miserly at the very moment when the solidarity of Europe is about to be achieved, at the very moment when Europeans are showing the will to stand up for their rights, the will to give out of their limited means for a united front against the Russian marauder.

There is nothing in this bill which can be lopped off without the gravest injury to our European allies and to ourselves. In the kind of world we have, the free peoples must hang together or they risk being hanged separately.

Let no one forget that in helping Europe, we are also helping ourselves. Free Europe must be defended by us if we do not want to defend ourselves alone at home. To stint our contribution to the rising power of the European democracies is to reject our duty as world leader and to renege on our commitment to our friends.

I cannot believe this House will fail to give complete approval to the recommendations of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the time I shall consume will be in discussing the philosophy behind this legislation rather than a consideration of the matter of cuts or the technical phases of it. I was very much interested to hear the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] state that we are a hated people in many parts of Europe. It seems to me that that is one of the things we should take into account as we consider this legislation because, after all, we are trying to help nations who will be friendly to us. It is rather difficult for me to support this kind of legislation when we know that we are not building the thing we want to build, namely, a defense against communism.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY A COMEDY OF ERRORS

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us involves foreign policy. It is certain to be an issue in the coming campaign. My position is well known by every Member of this House. I am absolutely against it because it has failed. I refuse to follow a leadership that is once again getting us dangerously involved in international affairs which might well precipitate world war III.

So that there will be no question about my position, I am serving notice that I wholly disagree with a member of the Wisconsin delegation in the other body who recently stated that, notwithstanding the mistakes of the present administration, he was ready and willing to follow its foreign policy.

He is further reported to have said, Mr. Chairman, that he would oppose any Member of Congress, in either party who would unjustifiably attack the foreign policy of this administration. Just what he meant by that statement I do not know, but obviously we are at opposite ends of the pole in this matter. This in no way affects our personal friendship as we can disagree without being disagreeable.

Mr. Chairman, the issue in foreign policy is not one of personalities, the only question is what are the foreign policies of this administration doing to and for our country? This involves a matter of leadership—Democratic leadership under our two-party system, if you please—which some people contend is a bipartisan matter. I deny it is or ever has been bipartisan. Whatever it is—as we look at the record since 1938, it has resulted in a comedy of errors. It has lost the peace; it has lost China; it has lost the war in Korea at a cost of 115,000 casualties; it has lost the friendship of 500,000,000 people in Asia; it is losing the friendship of 200,000,000 Moslems in the Middle East and North Africa; it slaps Franco in the face but embraces Tito in a mighty bunny hug; it attempts to stop communism on a

500-mile front in Europe yet the dangerous perimeter is 20,000 miles long. Indecision, instability and inconsistency have marked our foreign policy and it is driving this country to the verge of bankruptcy and the people to utter despair. We have fewer friends today than ever before in our history.

This legislation is to support the NATO military alliance, continue economic assistance, under the guise of military support and technical assistance. It is not a new scheme to shear the innocent taxpayer in this country but the continuance of an old one. How long will it continue? Neither Harriman nor Acheson would venture a guess but if the planners in the Department of State and Harriman's hired hands prevail it will be a long, long time.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago, I stated that this foreign spending program was not succeeding. I charged that it was the wrong approach to the Communist threat because it was based on the use of force—guns, tanks, planes, and bombs. Further, that the people of Europe and Asia were fearful that our objectives would lead to more war and a lower standard of living. That fear persists today.

At that time, Mr. Chairman, I did not think that today I would find myself in distinguished company. I ask your indulgence while I quote excerpts from recent addresses by John Foster Dulles, Republican, and Justice William O. Douglas, Democrat. This is a nonpartisan approach to the important issues raised in the bill before us.

On May 12, Mr. Dulles in an address on the subject Foreign Policy Needs said in part:

With nations, as with men, money is no substitute for character. Our Nation today is spending fabulous sums for security. The target this year is about \$30,000,000,000. We have given away, in one form or another, about \$40,000,000,000 since 1945. If money could buy security and happiness, we should have them. Yet we have them not. Today we are insecure, we have less good will than ever before in our history, and our people feel a sense of frustration.

"We are insecure, we have less good will than ever before" and this from a man who has been an ardent advocate of some phases of the administration's foreign policy. Here is the admission, yes, a confession, that the purpose in support of this legislation—our own national security—has not been achieved. "Unlimited spending should have purchased security and happiness," says Mr. Dulles, "yet we have them not." Thus he has kicked out the props from under this legislation.

Mr. Dulles, then points out that even though we have joined the United Nations and other international organizations, they have not succeeded. This is what he said:

However, we would not be honest with ourselves if we did not admit that today large numbers of our people feel disillusioned and unhappy about these collective organizations. They went into them with great hopes and they have seen our Nation spend on them large sums. Now, it seems that the original estimates on which our Nation proceeded were miscalculated because the peril,

which it was said would be removed, persists unabated.

"The peril persists unabated." If that is true how can the proponents of this bill now say this program has been successful?

Now listen to this further indictment that Dulles makes. He says:

Nothing which we have done tackles the No. 1 problem which is that of checking further Soviet aggression everywhere without such vast unproductive military expenditures as would destroy the very values we are trying to protect.

Mr. Chairman, many Republican Members of this House have taken the floor and have made the same charges that I have read from the Dulles address but we have been called isolationists and with giving aid and comfort to our enemies. Those charges, I assure you, will not deter us in the future when the welfare of our country is at stake.

Proof is piling up everywhere, Mr. Chairman, that our pushing for a gigantic military program is causing some alarm in both the East and West. As to that, Mr. Dulles says:

But we must bear in mind that our growing stockpile of atomic weapons subject to our unpredictable use or abuse, is not everywhere reassuring and indeed, in some respects it helps Soviet communism in its political warfare. The hard truth is, as my recent visits, in both East and the West have made clear to me, that many of the peoples of the world have less fear of the Red Army than fear that the United States may rashly precipitate atomic warfare, against which their population centers are utterly defenseless.

Mr. Chairman, every time this administration undertakes a spending program it cries "Wolf." It uses a fear technique to arouse the people in supporting its policies. Mr. Dulles said something about that, too:

As it is, we live through what is represented to be a series of crises. The assumption appears to be that the only emotion that will cause us to act is fear. The Congress and the people are constantly being told that unless we take emergency action, a terrible catastrophe will shortly befall.

He then pointed out that we were told in 1948 that 1950 would be the critical year. In 1950, that 1952 would surely be the dangerous year. Now we are told, 1954 is the one to prepare for. His answer to these arguments is:

I can see no more reason to assume that they—

Soviets—

plan to make open attack in 1954 than in in any other year, past or future.

Justice Douglas, a Democrat and high in the councils of his party, openly challenges the military aspects of our foreign policy. In an address before a forum in Philadelphia last March, he minced no words. He charged that this country is drifting in the direction of repression, drifting dangerously fast.

This is caused—

He said—

by the fact that we carried over to the days of peace, the military approach to world affairs. Diplomacy in our relations to Asia took a back seat. The military approach conditioned our thinking and our planning.

This leading Democrat also charged that our policies were not directed toward the people whose friendship is so greatly needed but rather toward those particular areas where we could setup military bases. Here are his words:

We forgot that democracy in many lands is an empty word; that the appeal is hollow when made to illiterate people living at the subsistence levels. We asked them to furnish staging grounds for a military operation whose outcome, in their eyes, had no perceptible relation to their own welfare.

This was the result of our military thinking, of our absorption in military affairs. In Asia, it has brought us the lowest prestige in our existence.

The military effort has been involving more and more of our sons, more and more of our budget, and more and more of our thinking. The military policy has so completely absorbed our thoughts that we have forgotten that our greatest strength, our enduring power, is not in guns but in ideas.

Today in Asia we are identified not with the ideas of freedom but with guns. Today at home we are thinking less and less in terms of defeating communism with ideas and more and more in terms of defeating communism with military might.

He then called attention to the fact that, notwithstanding enormous expenditures "Soviet imperialism continues to expand and that the expansion proceeds without the Soviets firing a shot. The free world continues to contract without a battle for its survival having been fought."

It becomes apparent—

Says he—

as country after country falls to Soviet imperialistic ambitions, that military policy alone is a weak one; that military policy alone will end in political bankruptcy and futility. Thus fear mounts.

Mr. Chairman, I have quoted at some length statements by two great Americans who say that the major phase of this legislation—the military—will not meet the issue of communism. There is a very great need for a new approach and it is the duty of our committee to undertake such a study. Our attention should be directed to the well-being of people and not to bankrupt socialistic governments. Our concern should be in higher standards of living for people in those areas where communism is expanding.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I shall address my remarks to the money requests in this bill. The asking figure is \$6,901,100,000 and for all practical purposes approximately seven billion dollars. If the information submitted to the committee is correct there is no need to authorize or appropriate any additional money for this global give-away program.

In a memorandum prepared by the committee staff on fiscal status of mutual security funds as of March 31, 1952, there are two interesting tables. I shall refer to the one relating to expenditure data. The information contained in the tables was prepared by the Comptroller, Office of the Director for Mutual Security, May 7, 1952, so obviously, it is up-to-date information.

According to that table the net cumulative funds available through fiscal year 1952 were \$26,063.4; cumulative expendi-

tures, March 31, 1952, \$14,700.7; unexpended balance, March 31, 1952, \$11,362.7; estimated expenditures, April 1, 1952, through June 30, 1952, \$2,417.6; unexpended balance, June 30, 1952, \$8,945.1.

Now there must be added to the unexpended balance, the amount carried in the bill before us, which is \$6,901.1; and United States military transfers, \$1,000.0; plus, military expenditures overseas, \$1,052.0; total, \$8,953.1; plus, unexpended balance above June 30, 1952, \$8,945.1; total available for expenditures for 1953, \$17,898.2; less, estimated expenditures, 1953, \$10,345.7; unexpended balance, June 30, 1953, \$7,552.5—above figures in millions of dollars.

If my computation is correct, there is no justification to support the full amount requested.

In this connection, I call attention to the position that has been taken by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States which heretofore has always supported the foreign-aid program. In a report issued by the Chamber on April 28, by the Director of Economic Research, Mr. Emerson P. Schmidt, the National Chamber of Commerce takes the position that I do—that because of the unexpended balance available, there is no need for any additional appropriation. On page 7 of its report, the Chamber recommends "that the Congress authorize no more foreign aid for fiscal year 1953."

It is well to keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that it is not what we authorize or appropriate but what can be produced in the way of material needs to support the program. Real production has not been forthcoming and if the total average for expenditures for 1953 of \$17,898,200,000 is correct and if the Mutual Security Administration intends to spend \$10,345,700,000, then the unexpended balance as of June 30, 1953, 1 year from now, would be \$7,552,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, proponents of this give-away scheme paint rosy word-pictures about the success of our efforts to remake the military and economic life of the NATO countries. They point to the Schuman plan, the so-called European Defense Community—still to be organized—the North Atlantic Treaty, and Lisbon Conference. They close their eyes to political unrest in Italy and France where the Communists hold a balance of power and existing governments are in constant jeopardy. They refuse to face up to the facts of life in the German situation. They ignore facts that indicate the people in Western Europe are resisting rearmament because of the drift to a lower standard of living; they cannot buy more guns and bread, too. Our insistence and persistence to rearm those countries is immoral. It will not win the battle against communism.

Bertrand de Jouvenel, a French writer said quite recently that the Europeans should naturally want military aid but in fact do not.

And they want it—

Said he—

all the less because it is urged upon them from the outside.

This writer clearly points out that the assumption of leadership by the United

States in the defense of Europe has blinded the bulk of European society to political reality. They are asking the question, "How far shall we contribute to the American effort in Europe?"

We must remember that Europe faces the problem of rearmament, plus obligations now imposed by the welfare state. There is quite obviously a tax burden that must be imposed by political leaders who refuse to assess the necessary taxes and take the attitude that the United States will pay the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it was recently pointed out from 1945 to 1952, France received four billions worth of American aid. The Governor of the Banque de France has reported that gold and hard-currency banknotes have been withdrawn from circulation and clandestinely hoarded by panicky Frenchmen. The people have lost confidence in their government. Twenty billion dollars of French money is now out of circulation. Is it any wonder the French economy is shaky? And so long as American taxpayers pour their dollars into France there is no need to use French money. How simple can we be and how long will we stay that way?

Mr. Chairman, the plain people in Europe are sick to death of the very idea of another war. They do not want another war and they will not pay the cost of rearmament. Yes, the diplomats and the generals profess there is the will to rearm and to fight but the unvarnished facts are that they fear our military program more than communism.

Walter Lippmann has said that our insistence on the formation of a European army must be dropped and that a political settlement between France and West Germany must be put ahead of everything else.

Last February, Mr. Dulles, in a speech in Iowa that did not receive much publicity, charged openly that our policy to contain Russia in military terms "is a self-defeating policy." The way out as he saw it then or the alternative to present policies is "enlightened economic policies that will enable free peoples by orderly methods, gradually and peacefully to improve their domestic conditions and to end any threat of violence that is genuinely domestic."

Mr. Chairman, our present foreign policies are promoting a Western European community based entirely on war. We have ignored the necessity of creating a sound political climate. Our strategic concept is to deter and defend. We can neither deter nor defend in the foreseeable future in spite of the NATO enthusiasts if the Russian military machine starts to move.

Mr. Chairman, Europe cannot afford the NATO war formula. The British Board of Trade figures for January show a British trade deficit still running at \$3,000,000,000 a year and that of the entire sterling area of about \$2,000,000,000. At that time they only had \$2,000,000,000 of sterling available and that is getting pretty close to the bottom of the barrel.

It is little wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the British Labor Party has been needing the Churchill government. The Prime Minister in Parliament has admitted that Bevan was right when he

charged that his government could not afford the American rearmament program.

Mr. Chairman, it has been no pleasant task for me to take this floor and speak out against the legislation that is before us. But I cannot remain silent and live with my own conscience.

I respectfully suggest again, Mr. Chairman, to the majority party that the time has come to reconsider the basic assumptions on which our present foreign policies rest. Republicans are ready to help and much can be accomplished around the conference table. As I see it, we can approach our problem by: First, considering a foreign policy of well-defined aims, which will, second, adhere to the basic principles upon which our Government was established, with special emphasis upon, third, assistance to self-help through private productivity, where it is requested. Human beings everywhere can solve their own problems where governments do not interfere. Men are made that way.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I am arising in opposition to this bill. It carries the label "The Mutual Security Act of 1952." The title is attractive and to a certain extent impelling, if we do not look beyond the immediate implications. It provides for an expenditure of \$6,901,100,000 to be used in assisting other nations in meeting their economic and military responsibilities. The purpose is laudable, there is no question about that. To say that this large expenditure would serve no good purpose would indicate utter disregard of the truth. Certainly it would be helpful to other countries.

There comes a time, however, when we cannot continue such huge expenditures without seriously disrupting our own economy. To my way of thinking, that hour has now arrived. Some of the money we have been appropriating for foreign-aid purposes has gone to countries whose fiscal status is in much better condition than our own. This is particularly true in the case of many of the countries of South America.

It is incumbent upon us at times to take stock of our own financial situation. In the statistics given out a few months ago by our own Department of Commerce and confirmed by the Library of Congress, the purchasing power of our dollar has declined, in terms of the wholesale price index, to approximately 44 cents, using the years 1935-39 as a base—not 1932 but 1935-39. When calculations are made in terms of the Consumers' Price Index, the purchasing power of the dollar is approximately 54 cents.

No matter what index is used, the dollar has declined almost one-half in the last 12 years. Should this decline continue in like amount for the next 12 years, our dollar will hardly purchase a newspaper. What then will be the position of those who are depending upon their pensions, their social-security payments, or other retirement allowances for support during the time when earnings will have ceased? What will have happened to the value of the life-insur-

ance policies into which so many thrifty individuals have placed their hard-earned money?

But, you say, these thoughts are ridiculous. Are they? The lessons of history should be our guide in our thinking on this subject. No nation has been able to survive with a sound currency that has followed our practice in regard to deficit spending year after year. During the last 20 years, we have indulged in deficit spending in the amount of \$222,000,000,000; we have balanced the budget only 3 years in 20—and two of those years are to the credit of the Eightieth Republican Congress. Deficit spending furnishes the fertile soil from which inflationary spirals spring, and our President has proposed a budget that will add \$14,000,000,000 to a public debt which is now almost twice that of all the free nations of the world combined.

Our national debt is now approaching \$260,000,000,000. This Federal debt is 85 percent greater than the combined debts of all nations, excluding China, Russia, Iraq, Lebanon, Algeria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Germany, and a few other areas for which no public statistics are available. We propose to collect in taxes this year approximately \$71,000,000,000, which is only slightly less than the total tax burdens of the remaining free nations.

Taxes paid during the 156 years of our history, beginning with the year 1789 and ending with the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, amounted to \$245,000,000,000. The present administration collected between April 13, 1945, and January 31, 1952, a total of \$275,000,000,000. In other words, the Truman administration, prior to January 31, 1952, had collected \$30,000,000,000 more in taxes than all the Presidents that preceded him. Now, we are told, this is not enough—that we need more—and that we shall face a deficit of approximately \$14,000,000,000, if the President's recommendations, in his budget for fiscal 1953, are followed.

There is much danger ahead of us if this huge spending program, and especially the deficit-spending phase, is not curtailed. When I was in Germany, before it entered its inflationary spiral, the German mark was worth about 25 cents. I received four of them in exchange for one American dollar. After Germany had gone to the end of the road in her inflationary spiral, I bought a billion German marks for a dollar and a half. I was in France, also, when she had a sound currency, and the French franc was worth approximately 20 cents. The exchange there gave me 5 francs for an American dollar. On November 19, 1952, the black market in France quoted the exchange on the franc at the rate of 480 for an American dollar, although our own dollar is worth only about half what it was a few years ago. The wholesale price index in France increased 1,917 percent between 1939 and 1949.

Much has been said about losses suffered during the bank-closing which occurred during the depression of the early thirties. I do not propose to minimize those losses. They were severe and

worked great hardship upon many individuals. The loss through bank-closings has been set at \$116,565,524. Do you know how that figure compares with losses sustained by reason of the decrease in the purchasing power of the American dollar? The value of life insurance policies, time deposits, and E, F, and G savings bonds has depreciated \$1,901,000,000 since the year 1940. This is approximately 60 times the losses suffered in the bank closings which attracted so much attention. The latter erosion in values has taken place gradually over a period of 12 years, and little consideration has been given to it. But it is there just the same, and represents one of the greatest calamities that has ever been perpetrated upon an unsuspecting people.

Now why is the subject of deficit spending of importance in the debate on this measure before us today? It is important because much of that deficit has been created through our efforts to help the rest of the world. We have appropriated for foreign aid since we began our lend-lease program prior to World War II approximately \$97,000,000,000. Certain credits must be deducted from that amount, but the books show that during the period beginning in 1938 and ending March 31, 1951, the net foreign aid provided was \$69,899,000,000. To this, must be added \$7,329,000,000 appropriated during the last session of the Congress—making a total of \$77,228,000,000.

This is a sizable sum and while there is no gainsaying that the aid extended has been very helpful to other countries, the time has come, in my opinion, when we must call a halt if we wish to save our own country from disaster. One purpose of foreign aid was to help the countries of Europe recover from the serious effects of World War II—a very worthy motive—much of their industrial potential was greatly damaged by the ravages of war, but the index of production in those countries is now far ahead of pre-war. In proof, I present the following figures taken from the thirteenth report to the Congress of the ECA, page 17:

Production in Atlantic Pact nations (using 1937 production levels as 100 percent)

Austria.....	157
Belgium.....	146
Denmark.....	163
France.....	143
Greece.....	130
Italy.....	139
Netherlands.....	147
Norway.....	156
United Kingdom.....	158

Another factor which has a bearing on the appropriation for foreign aid which is before us today is the balance remaining over from previous appropriations at this time. The latest figures available are as of September 30, 1951. At that time, foreign aid unexpended funds amounted to \$17,241,000,000. Since that date, it is estimated that \$5,000,000,000 have been spent which leaves a balance of \$12,241,000,000. Is it not reasonable to believe—at least to hope—that we can coast along on this unexpended balance for another year without additional appropriations. It seems to me that in

view of our own fiscal condition, we might consider this to be a legitimate assumption, and that it will be distinctly unfair to our American taxpayers, should we unload on them an additional \$6,901,000,000, as provided in this bill.

There is one other phase of this situation I should like to discuss. We have undertaken to fight a United Nations war in Korea. The President calls it a police action, but in my book, it is war. That war is costing us \$5,000,000,000 a year. We are footing the bill for this war to the extent of about 95 percent of all costs. Civilian aid to the people of Korea has cost about \$500,000,000—only about \$25,000,000 of which has been contributed by other members of the United Nations. Do not these expenditures constitute foreign aid to a large extent? We are not only furnishing the money to fight the war in Korea, we are furnishing the blood of our sons in just about the same proportion as our money. It seems unreasonable that we should be expected to do more. Have we not done more than our share already?

The lessons of history on this subject of spending are written so plainly that he who reads may well understand. We are today, with our foreign-aid program, supporting the bankrupt nations of Europe with our hard-earned money—it is your money and mine—that we are spending in every quarter of the globe. Not only in Europe but in the countries of South America whose fiscal status is in much better condition than our own. Who will pull us out of insolvency when our Nation has exhausted its resources? What Marshall plan will come to the aid of America in that fateful hour?

Our job today is here at home. It is a domestic job. Russia's blueprint for world domination was outlined by Lenin a quarter of a century ago when he said:

England will expand herself into destruction; Germany will fight herself into destruction; and America will spend herself into destruction.

Two nations have gone the Lenin-predicted road, and we are on the way. If we do not reform our fiscal policy, Russia without firing a shot and without the loss of a soldier will have won her conquest of the world.

This is not a partisan fight. It is a fight to preserve America, our freedoms, our way of life.

The peril of this Nation—

Said Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes—

is not a foreign foe. We, the people, are its power, its peril, and its hope.

Here is a challenge for all Americans. Against a background such as I have described, shall we be able to keep a sound currency from being destroyed? Shall we in our attempts to pull the rest of the world back slip into the abyss ourselves? Because of these problems, we face one of the most crucial periods in our history. We face our crucial test of devotion to our American way of life.

We can ill afford the expenditures for foreign aid proposed in this legislation which amount to \$6,901,000,000. We must begin to think of saving our own country before it is too late. A vote

against this bill is a vote for the preservation of America—our liberties, our freedoms, our way of life—yes, it is a vote to safeguard the whole world because if America goes down, the world is lost with us.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued by the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin that a price tag can be placed on what this Congress and this Nation has been trying to do. I wonder if Mr. DOUGLAS or Mr. DULLES have indicated just how many dollars and just how many cents are necessary to win a victory or win a peace or win a cold war? I wonder whether the gentleman from Wisconsin or whether any Member of this distinguished body at this time can give to this committee a yardstick or a rule of thumb and say: This many dollars will contain atheistic communism—this many dollars in hundreds of millions or in dozens of billions is the answer that we all seek?

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that communism has been contained.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the foreign policy of this administration is very clear and very simple indeed. Whether it has been successful can be debated, as intelligent men are debating it here and throughout the Nation. But, Mr. Chairman, the foreign policy is as plain as the nose on your individual and collective faces. The foreign policy is to fight and fight, and contain atheistic communism any place that it rears its ugly head on the face of this earth, now and forever. That is the foreign policy. Who will deny it? Does anyone object?

Korea: Never in the history of civilized warfare, never in the history of civilized man has any nation thrown down the gauntlet to any nation or any other philosophy or any other idea or ideal as the United States of America and the President of the United States threw down the gauntlet to communism in Korea and raised the standard of hope for freemen and small nations throughout the world when he said, "No. You move here or any place else and this is what you will meet, weak or strong as we may be at the time, as poorly as we are prepared, or as we are not prepared." Which is an entirely different argument as to whether we are or are not prepared, and that is a different point.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not yield.

Communism has been contained. Mr. Chairman, communism has been contained in Turkey, and the Turks will fight and die to the man against communism there. Communism has been contained in Greece, and the brave Greeks will fight and die to a man. In Yugoslavia you have an ally. Whether you like them or not, whether you want to go to bed with them or not is your business. I do not. But right now he is mine. And in Spain—agreements are being made in Spain and they will be successful agreements. They will be

successful agreements and Spain will be allied with free people, and the Gibraltar entrance to the Straits will be protected.

Do you think for a moment that the brave, noble Scandinavians, the Swedes, the Norwegians, and Danes have not contained communism?

Do you think for a moment that in brave England communism has not been contained? Fought in France and defeated in Italy? Oh, the Anzacs in Australia and New Zealand will forever be an anchor against any aggression made by communism in the Far East.

When you say nothing has been done, when you say what have we gained for these billions, what makes you think that this is the end? Do you want communism to be contained in 1 day or 1 year? Mr. Chairman, you face half a century or the end of time, but we will face it and defeat it and destroy it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we are here confronted with extension of a program that is playing a major part in leading this country down the road to ruin.

This proposal calls not only for the spending of additional billions of dollars which American taxpayers can ill afford, but if enacted it amounts to a stamp of approval by Congress of this administration's foreign policy, the chief architects of which are Truman and Acheson.

It is a foreign policy which has led to the shambles of Korea—in terms of men and money the second most costly external war in which the United States has engaged. And the end is not yet.

It is a foreign policy which during recent years has cunningly contrived a series of emergencies and crises by which the administration has been able to dodge the economic facts of life, and from all this stems the arrogant attempts at seizure of power by the present Chief Executive.

Is anyone in this Chamber so blind as not to be able to see the broad delegations of power that have been given the President in international affairs? The bill before you is but one sample of how authority is delegated.

By what constitutional right has the conduct of foreign affairs and the making of war been concentrated in the hands of the President?

In 1793, Thomas Jefferson, patron saint of the Democratic Party, called this "heresy," and James Madison bitterly assailed "the extraordinary doctrine that the powers of making war and treaties are in their nature executive." Madison described such usurpation as British political theory, un-American, and supported only "by foreigners and degenerate citizens among us."

Have we degenerated today to the point where we do not understand or do not care that this foreign policy on which we are embarked, military and economic, is the prime cause of the debauchery of our dollars despite a levying of taxes that promises to be more back-

breaking than those carried by any other people in the world?

I warn you now that you have no time to lose in trimming the commitments being made under the foreign policy of the United States unless it is your desire to fulfill the dreams of the Kremlin by causing the moral and financial collapse of this great, free Nation.

And let me add here, for the particular benefit of those supporting candidates for the Presidency who would continue present foreign policies, with all their lavish spending, that they are advocates of further centralization of power in the hands of the Executive.

It is no less than double talk on the part of a presidential candidate or anyone supporting him to say that an administration shall have wide powers in the conduct of foreign affairs and yet be held to strict constitutional checks and balances in the conduct of domestic affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment briefly at this point on one of the most beautifully perfumed yet evil phrases that has been concocted in recent years, and there have been plenty of them in that time. I refer to "bipartisan foreign policy."

We had scarcely heard of this sweet-smelling monster until the Potsdam Conference began to reveal the colossal mistakes—the number of first mortgages that Stalin had obtained at Yalta and held on the lives and fortunes of those who inhabit these United States.

In an effort to conceal the truth from the American people and stifle criticism in Congress, the bipartisan foreign policy deal was rigged. As a narcotic and a snare it worked well, for under it the Marshall plan blossomed to full flower, to be succeeded by the perfumed alphabetical agency known as the ECA, and now by the honey-titled Mutual Security Assistance Act. I have yet to be advised of the mutuality or security that has been obtained despite the blood that has been spilled and the sweat that has been shed to produce the tax dollars.

In the first place, there is no such thing as a bipartisan foreign policy that is not at one and the same time accompanied by a bipartisan domestic policy. More than that, there is no place in a healthy democracy, except when completely mobilized for war, for a bipartisan policy, foreign or domestic. He who advocates this approach to one-party government is willing to walk the road of the Hitlers and Mussolinis of yesterday, and the Stalins, Titos, Francos, and Perons of today. A policy of bipartisanism, except in the most extreme national peril, will mean the end of representative government in America.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is unacceptable. Our expensive foreign friends who will not support us in Korea, where Americans bear the burden of battle virtually alone, still show little or no inclination to stand with us anywhere else.

We need only to read statements of influential foreign newspapers, magazines, and officials to recognize the unvarnished fact that all too many foreigners despise the United States in spite of the more than 100,000,000,000 American tax

dollars handed out all over the world since 1940. Truman, Acheson, Harriman, Eisenhower, and assorted international bedfellows do not make this information available to you, so I will.

At the moment, in the eyes of foreigners, the main American "floparoo" is the Eisenhower-Acheson NATO international army in Europe. The recent Lisbon announcement, alleging that the NATO army would grow to 50 divisions by the end of 1952, touched off violent reactions.

Almost in the shadow of Eisenhower's headquarters, the Paris newspaper, *Le Monde*, says in an editorial:

It includes on paper 12 French divisions instead of the 14 originally provided for; 7 American divisions, composed of the 6 now in Germany, plus 1 of marines. * * * It is improbable that the figures indicated can be attained. It is already admitted that the total NATO divisions fully ready within 10 months will not add up to more than 30.

Then the French newspaper says:

Surely the publication of these figures was an attempt at bluff, which has not even the merit of deceiving anybody. * * * The figures in question represent only a ceiling.

With such an attitude prevailing is it any wonder that the French Government collapsed almost as soon as the Lisbon announcement was made because French politicians refused to raise taxes to provide \$157,000,000 for the NATO army even though the United States promised to give France, as a virtual bribe to support the NATO proposition, another \$300,000,000 in foreign aid and more than a half billion dollars in war contracts. All this, of course, is over and above the billions of American dollars previously poured into the French treasury, as I discussed in these pages at the time.

Incidentally, the French newspaper's reference to one American Marine division was, as far as I know, the first leak that the Pentagon plans to throw American marines into the NATO international military.

Returning to foreign reaction to the Lisbon announcement, the London Times describes the promise of 50 divisions by the end of 1952 as imaginative and the allegation of 85 to 100 divisions in 2 years as still more imaginative. The London paper says:

There is likely to be a sharp reaction when the American people realize that the 50 promised divisions do not really mean 50 divisions.

The Brussels newspaper, *Revue Politique*, says Belgium, reportedly committed to the munificent total of two divisions in the NATO military, has fulfilled all her military obligations—which is more than can be said for all her allies.

The Brussels paper continues:

Belgium cannot agree to make further financial efforts without recompense.

As recompense the Belgium paper suggests that the United States establish another foreign-aid kitty into which all the NATO nations could reach to pay all their military costs. This recalls my prediction of several weeks ago that if

the NATO army will cost \$300,000,000,000, as announced at Lisbon, American taxpayers will fork over most of it.

A British magazine, *European Review*, calls the NATO military force a shadow, saying what is needed on the potential battlefield is the will to fight, not merely paper armies and paper agreements. This magazine apparently sees little hope of a will to fight becoming a reality, declaring:

Fifty divisions of conscripted robot soldiers, even if they existed and were encased in nylon armor and equipped with atomic weapons, would represent a dangerous substitute for human minds who know what they stand for and love what they know. When the spirit is unwilling, the body is apt to be distressingly weak.

Then the British magazine points to the recent fall of the French Government as evidence that the spirit is indeed unwilling.

In this connection, Andre Philip, former French Minister of Finance, says the young people of France no longer believe in anything.

And British Leftist Leader Bevan tells us to our teeth that the perils of war have been brought appreciably nearer by the ascendancy now given American leadership in foreign affairs. That is the kind of friend the Truman multi-billion-dollar dole has won in Britain.

As thanks for the millions of American loan dollars given to the Spanish dictatorship, Nicolas Franco, Spanish Ambassador in Portugal, suggests that Britain and Spain set up a controlled-economy bloc extending from Scandinavia to the Cape of Good Hope, using as a medium of exchange the British pound sterling, not American dollars. "Such a bloc," he said, "would offset the possibility of either America or Russia doing anything without the consent of Europe."

These are the foreign friends our international spenders talk so glibly about. In this column today you have seen some of these foreigners through their own words.

The policy of trying to bribe and buy friends has failed. That fact should be the foundation for a desperately needed new pro-American foreign policy.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it serves no useful purpose to discuss the moot point whether we should have initiated a program for the mutual defense of Western Europe and other critical areas of the world. We are already engaged in such a program. However, to keep the record straight, let me just say at this point that the Senate ratified the North Atlantic Treaty and the House had no voice in creating this program. As a matter of fact, when it was first proposed that the Congress should implement this program through the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, I joined with several of my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee in protest against such action for the reasons set forth in the minority report made at that time—House Report No. 1265, part 2, Eighty-first Congress, pages 62-67. Our views did not prevail. Military

equipment of all kinds has now been poured into Europe and other areas of the world. Six of our divisions are in Europe as well as large contingents of naval and air forces.

H. R. 7005 is designed to continue and implement this program. Hardly anyone would argue at this late date that we should withdraw all our support from Europe and other critical areas and leave these countries to the mercy of Soviet aggression. We are therefore confronted with the problem not of changing the basic decision that was made when the Senate committed us to the defense of Western Europe by the North Atlantic Treaty, but to what extent we should implement this program at the present time.

Since 1947 we have appropriated in the neighborhood of \$28,000,000,000 for foreign aid. From these appropriations specifically earmarked for military and economic aid, it is estimated that as of June 30, 1952, there will be an unexpended balance of approximately \$8,900,000,000.

A large portion of this has been obligated, but whether it has been obligated or unexpended is unimportant because eventually it will be available for economic and military purposes for which it was appropriated.

From the \$11,500,000,000 already appropriated for military aid only \$1,796,000,000 in military end items was shipped by February 29, 1952.

The question then arises—with this large backlog of funds available for military end items and economic support, how much further should we go at this time?

Recently at the Lisbon Conference, according to General Gruenther's testimony, commitments were made by the countries concerned that there should be raised an army of 50 divisions in Western Europe and the necessary air, navy, and infrastructure required to round out such a program. The testimony further discloses that the program agreed upon at this conference can be completed from appropriations already provided except for a certain percentage of spare parts which would require additional appropriations.

While it is of course true there are studies under way to increase the strength of the defense of Western Europe for the years 1953 and 1954, they are in the planning stage and no firm commitments have been made. Yet under these circumstances we are asked to authorize \$6,900,000,000 under the pending bill. While this is approximately \$1,000,000,000 less than the President requested, let me respectfully call your attention to the fact that in the pending bill, as reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee, it is provided that \$1,000,000,000 of our own defense matériel may be transferred for the defense of Western Europe in addition to the \$6,900,000,000 provided. So in reality the committee made no cut whatsoever.

Since there are no firm commitments to be fulfilled, other than those already provided for by previous appropriations, why is it not reasonable that both the military and economic authorizations in this bill be cut drastically until such

time as we have evidence before us that such expenditures are fully justified?

We must keep in mind our own needs in the Korean war. We all know there have been shortages of important military items for our own fighting forces there. Certainly we should meet our own requirements first.

So far as economic aid is concerned, it seems to me we can make even greater cuts than in military end items. Everyone knows we have spent billions under the Marshall plan for economic aid to Western Europe. The Marshall plan is supposed to end June 30, 1952. We should not continue it under the new name of defense support. This bill provides for \$1,637,000,000 for economic aid, having been cut by the Foreign Affairs Committee from \$1,819,000,000. The argument is made that because of the additional military effort by the European countries they must necessarily decrease their normal economic requirements. Therefore we must continue aid to make up the difference.

This economic aid is now called "defense support," but it is the same old balance of payments formula with which we are all so familiar.

To put it simply, a country determines its economic requirements; for example, how much raw materials, grain, and so forth, it must import to keep the country at what it believes is its required economic standard of living. It is then determined how much it has available to pay for these imports from its exports and other available assets.

One finds in all these countries that the exports and other assets are not sufficient to pay for their alleged necessary imports, leaving deficits which we are asked to make up.

So, under the guise of defense support, we are really continuing to a large extent economic aid per se the same as we have been doing under the Marshall plan.

Even when you allow for the validity of the arguments that a country's defense effort does cut to some extent its budget, which would otherwise be used for its own economic needs, we must keep in mind that here in this country we are being taxed to the limit. We are spending three-fourths of our budget for our defense. Every day we are going into the red at a phenomenal figure. All of our citizens are required to make sacrifices. Under the circumstances is it asking too much for our friends abroad to also make similar sacrifices?

It is therefore apparent a large cut should be made from the \$1,637,000,000 requested for economic aid.

There is another proposal in this bill for technical assistance—that is to rehabilitate a great many of the backward countries of the world. However worthy the objective may be, we must consider the financial stability of our own country. If we go broke we would not be able to help anyone. When we are straining ourselves to the utmost, it seems to me this type of program can be curtailed or even postponed.

As we consider this bill, I would like to comment on four or five provisions:

First, I firmly believe we could cut the defense support items for western

Europe by at least \$500,000,000—probably more.

Second. I definitely feel we should cut to the bone the point 4 program—especially where it is not involved in our defense effort.

Third. In my judgment we should also restrict the point 4 program to its original objective, namely, giving technical and scientific assistance toward rehabilitating some of the backward countries—that is, helping them to help themselves. I believe a formula could be worked out which would prevent funds that are available under this program from being used in constructing projects such as dams, power plants, irrigation systems, and so forth. We should confine ourselves to furnishing only the know-how and not create a WPA all over the world.

Fourth. The provision permitting \$1,000,000,000 of our own military matériel to be transferred to Western Europe, in addition to the amounts provided in this bill, should not be approved unless out of these authorizations and subsequent appropriations our own defense is fully reimbursed out of foreign-aid funds for these transfers.

Fifth. In almost every bill we have written on this subject, we have expressed the pious hope for both political and military unification in Western Europe. But the State Department has dragged its feet whenever it was proposed to put into law conditions which would bring this about in exchange for our continued aid. Certainly this is not asking too much. There is not a well-informed person in Europe today who does not realize the truth of the old saying of Benjamin Franklin, "We must hang together or we will hang separately."

Unless a substantial number of the recommendations which I have here presented are adopted, I cannot support this measure because I firmly believe its success or failure depends upon approaching the problem with common sense and not as profligate wasters of the taxpayers' money.

We must cut out the gingerbread. We must do first things first and not attempt to do more than we are capable of doing.

Remember this: Just spending money alone will not bring about security or cure all the economic ills of the world. If it could, we would be well on our way to these objectives. It requires the full cooperation and self-help of all the countries concerned.

It is a long haul. We should not attempt it all at once, but should proceed in an orderly fashion with the welfare and security—both military and economic—of our own country considered above everything else. Travel slowly and you will travel far.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I conceive it to be the duty of members of the committee who are discussing this

subject in general debate to give to the Committee of the Whole, insofar as they can, the fundamental philosophy which underlies the views of that part of the committee which is for the bill as it is brought on the floor, and to answer the points that have been made against this, upon the fundamental basis that we have participated in the hearings, have studied the subject, and should give the benefit of our opinion to all the other Members. It is in that spirit, Mr. Chairman, that I speak here today.

I am for this bill as it stands. I think it is a fair and reasonable compromise between the conflicting views as the money we can afford to spend and the security which we seek in the world through the expenditure of our money. I think the greatest mistake that can be made in connection with this bill is to consider that it represents hand-outs, gifts, charity, philanthropy, or anything else of that character, for unless we can find that it means in terms of American security, and American well-being, at least dollar for dollar—and I think we can find that it means two and three dollars for every one dollar—if it can be evaluated in terms of money at all—then we have no business to pass this bill, much as I am for it.

I am convinced that this bill represents an integral part of American security. It calls for an over-all expenditure of something in the magnitude of 10 percent of everything that we are spending for our own Armed Forces. For that figure we are getting an enormous amount of additional aid in connection with world security, I think at an extremely low price, certainly far lower than if we were trying to amass all the armament ourselves.

I just heard the gentleman from Iowa refer to presidential candidates. I hope very much that this question will not be brought up in connection with this debate. But if it is brought up it is my deep conviction, as far as the presidential candidate who has expressed himself as supporting this program and as supporting substantially the amount that is called for in the House bill for this program, that I thoroughly agree with that presidential candidate, and I am delighted to be supporting him. It seems to me that the fundamental difference, if there is any difference, as between presidential candidates, is whether or not we shall have a fortress United States of America for ourselves, or whether we should be a world power, carrying world responsibilities, and allied with the free world. The one thing I was pleased to hear this morning was, in substance, from my colleague from Ohio, was recognition of the fact that we were a leading world power, that we had world responsibilities, and that we knew we had to align ourselves with the free world. All differences in this bill we can resolve, but this is the fundamental difference, and if this represents a fundamental difference between presidential candidates, then I am definitely on the side of General Eisenhower as he has expressed himself on this issue.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman understand that any President elected will have to live with this monstrosity for another year?

Mr. JAVITS. I may say to the gentleman that I do not consider it a monstrosity. On the contrary, I consider this bill an integral and vital part of the policy of the United States, both foreign and domestic.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to draw the gentleman's attention to page 24 of the bill which purports to amend section 516 of the Mutual Security Act, to require the Mutual Security Agency, the State Department, and the Technical Cooperation Administration to take some action to remove legal and other impediments to private investment abroad. I understand the gentleman had some interest in incorporating that language in this measure; am I correct?

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman did, and may I reciprocate to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] and say that my colleague has been one of the most effective and forceful Members in the House in trying also to introduce this vital element of private enterprise into this whole program.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he thinks that movement of encouraging investment abroad should be an important part of American foreign policy.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it is an indispensable part, and, as I say, I think the gentleman's work in that field has been excellent and has shown its effect and will continue to show its effect because this is essentially a matter of administration. It is when Members of Congress get back of this effort and believe in it that we move the administrators off the small seat upon which they sit in this respect.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask further whether the gentleman has confidence that these three agencies named in this section of the bill will actually accomplish very much more than they have in the past simply because Congress orders them to do what perhaps they should have been doing anyhow?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not have as much confidence as I ought to have considering the fact that I have had a good deal to do with this part of the program. I believe that under the existing situation and without getting into a political discussion we ought to do all we can with this Administration we have. I am certainly hopeful we can get a better and more effective Administration. I would like to say to the gentleman it is only if people like him and me and others in the House who are similarly interested will constantly be back of this effort to utilize private enterprise effectively in the technical and economic phases of the program, armed with the determination of Congress as contained in the bill and as I hope it will mature finally, that we

will get any action at all, let alone adequate action.

Now to recur to my main thesis:

There are a number of contradictions which the opponents of this particular measure and of the whole mutual security program engage in which I think we should understand clearly because they bear upon the fundamental purpose of the bill.

First, let us understand that we are talking in the European program, which is the main program, about fortifying for self-help in connection with security 205,000,000 people who enjoy a gross annual national product, that is, a total production of goods and services, of \$153,000,000,000—and that we are 153,000,000 people and our gross national product is \$348,000,000,000, more than twice as much. That is the fundamental fact of our time. We have to carry a much greater share of the burden of defense than is prorated or based upon population, because the fundamental and unalterable fact is that we have 50 percent of the industrial production of the world and these figures show it.

What do we expect, then? Do we expect that people who are already poor shall further beggar themselves for our security and their own, or do we expect they will look to us, with much fewer people than they have, and over twice their gross national product, to help them in a material way? Unless we accept that fundamental proposition, this bill does not make any sense, but if we do accept it, then the bill falls into place and makes excellent sense. I submit that it is an unalterable fact that we must accept and cannot overlook.

Now, as to some of the other contradictions:

Some of those who talk here about indiscriminate cutting say, "Let us cut it another 20 percent or more." I ask those gentlemen to make up their minds whether they are just dealing with dollars, or whether they are dealing with security. Is not the real question, What are we going to get in divisions, what are we going to get in armament, what are we going to get in willing help, when we are talking about 10 percent of our own total defense outlay? Is not that the real question, rather than can we save dollars?

Certainly we can save dollars. You can eliminate this program entirely. If we eliminate enough dollars, it is like the Scotchman and his horse, who saved a lot on feeding the horse—that is until the horse got so thin that he died.

Second, some claim the Korean action and the casualties we have taken in Korea are unnecessary. They want us to retreat to fortress America. I ask the question of them, Do they want us to retreat to fortress America and take all the casualties ourselves, or do they want us to share with the rest of the world some of the responsibility of security and, therefore, some of the responsibility and some of the dangers of taking casualties?

Some say that aid which we have given, and one of my colleagues just said that a minute ago, has not gotten down

to the rock-bottom base of the people in the various areas which we have aided, and yet those are the same people who are against economic aid. We are certainly not going to get it down to the rock bottom base of the people unless we are willing to give some aid so that it can get down there.

Then, some say that we should give our friends abroad the know-how, but we should not give them goods; that we should just give them know-how and not materials. Yet, these are the very same people who are in the main against technical assistance, and say that this is just boondoggling and wasting our hard-won knowledge all around the world.

It is my deep conviction that all of this represents frustration as to what our American foreign policy ought to be. We know one thing. American foreign policy has to be affirmative. It cannot be negative. I think, therefore, if all who want affirmative action will consider the bill in those terms, then a good bill and an adequate bill in terms of money will be passed.

We all know we do not want to start a preventive war against the Soviet Union. That would be the treacherously easy way. If we started a preventive war, then military defense would really be an offense, and we would be going to the seats of power of communism and destroying them. If we do not want that, and the American people plus our own judgment have settled that issue, then the total amount that we are spending for military security is purely defensive. We know that we can never lick communism solely by defensive effort. Therefore, we have to have an offensive effort. The only offensive we have is the offensive in the economic and technical field and in the ideological field. If at one and the same time we say we do not want a preventive war, and we want to defeat communism, then there may be ample room for differing as to the details, but we must accept the fundamental concept of this bill.

The administration policy of containment is obsolescent. It must now be succeeded by a policy of counterattack. This counterattack must be diplomatic as through the U. N. That is why all efforts toward disarmament, control of atomic weapons, and the elimination of the effect of the veto in the U. N. on halting aggression are so important. It must include the use of economic and technical assistance such as is provided for here in this bill. It must include the speeding up of our information and education program, whether it be through the Voice of America or through books or through publications, we need to do a very much more effective job. The important thing is that we need to do the job.

Even in the military respect, we have to emphasize the idea of counterattack. The best thing I think that Mr. Acheson ever did was when he said the other day that we are not just going to repeal aggression at the point where it occurs, as we did in Korea, but that the Soviet must understand that from now on, if

we are going to have to meet aggression here and aggression there and everywhere, they are going to drive us to stopping aggression by action at the seat of the Soviet power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, all of our colleagues are deeply interested in what will be the indicia of success in this struggle against communism. How do we know that in this program for which we are paying so substantially and making so many sacrifices for—how will we know when we begin to succeed? I say to my colleagues we already know that it has begun to succeed in the defection of Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc. This defection will ultimately be in my view the single, significant fact of history which showed the recession of the Soviet power. The end of the Soviet power will be when all of the satellites, including China, are detached. But, the beginning of the end of the Soviet power is shown by the defection of Yugoslavia. Certainly, Tito is a Communist, a hard headed and a very practical one seeking the protection, I believe, of his own power, and that of his group and of his own country. How did he look at it in this cold war as soon as he felt that the Russians could not successfully use force on him. What did he decide? He decided under these policies which are contained in this bill that it was better for him to work with the West than to continue to string along with the Soviet Union. Why? Because he felt that ultimately the Soviet Union and the Communist group which had control of it had to be defeated. It seems to me that Yugoslavia's defection is among the important evidences of the rightness of the general lines of policy dealt with in this bill.

It is an elementary principle in diplomacy and of military affairs that you must ride your strength. You must drive your offensive. That is not the time to quit when you begin to succeed. That is the time to put on the steam and to drive even harder. That is exactly the purpose of this bill. We are beginning to show signs of success in this struggle against communism, and I am for pressing that success to a final and decisive conclusion.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this opportunity to address the Committee to discuss an amendment I intend to offer to the mutual-security bill, which is now before us.

The purpose of my amendment is to take a concrete step toward assuming the initiative in the cold, ideological war between freemen and slave citizens. I propose that we do this by proving to the world that the free economy exemplified in the United States is a better way of life, both materially and spiritually, than the state-owned, state-controlled economy of the totalitarian state exemplified by Communist Russia.

I do not minimize the importance of words and expressions of philosophical principles upon the course of civilization. But I contend that action speaks louder than words. I assert that a demonstration of the free-enterprise system will do more toward winning support on our side of the ideological war than 100 Voices of America.

I propose that we should demonstrate the value of the competitive free-enterprise system by exporting that system to the underdeveloped areas of the world. If we do this effectively, we will launch an affirmative attack upon the false ideology that the state should run everything, leaving no freedom or individuality to the citizens who, through police methods, are forced to do as they are told.

The avenue for accomplishing the export of the free-enterprise system consists in the elimination of the artificial legal and political barriers which now restrain natural economic forces and prevent capital from free nations from flowing into other free areas, more or less undeveloped, to harness the natural resources of those areas for the mutual benefit of the inhabitants of those areas and those supplying the capital and development know-how.

I have yet to discover anyone opposed to this fundamental proposition. On the contrary, it has received universal support even including pronouncements by members of the present administration. Indeed, this proposition is given lip service in existing legislation. As a principle, it is written into the Mutual Security Program and has been espoused in general terms by the President of the United States, as well as the Secretary of State.

I quote from section 516 of the Mutual Security Act the following language:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that this act shall be administered in such a way as (1) to eliminate the barriers to, and provide the incentives for, a steadily increased participation of free private enterprise in developing the resources of foreign countries consistent with the policies of this act.

I point out that the bill now pending before the House of Representatives, H. R. 7005, section 7 J, commencing on page 24, line 16, of the bill, and continuing to page 26, line 9, instructs the Mutual Security Agency, the Department of State, and the Technical Cooperation Administration to study legal and other impediments to private investment and the means whereby such impediments may be removed or decreased and facilitate the flow of private investment and the participation of private industrial groups or agencies in accomplishing the economic objectives of the Mutual Security Program.

Mr. Chairman, my proposal is that these studies and these recommendations be made by an independent commission, calling upon the services of private citizens whose knowledge and whose thinking ought to be enlisted in the attack upon the barriers and impediments now restraining natural economic forces from developing natural resources abroad in accordance with the principles

of the competitive free-enterprise system.

For those who may be interested in following this subject in some detail, I include at this point in my remarks a

Remarks by Representative George Meader on proposal to create a commission to study impediments to private investment in underdeveloped foreign areas

Date	Nature of remarks	Reference
Apr. 23, 1951	Speech on floor of House introducing H. R. 3798.....	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4209-4214.
July 3, 1951	Speech on floor of House, "Let's Export Independence" ..	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 7606-7609.
July 20, 1951	Testimony before House Foreign Affairs Committee.	Hearings on H. R. 5020 and H. R. 5113, pp. 778-819.
Aug. 16, 1951	Speech on floor of House offering amendment to H. R. 5113.	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10179-10180.
Aug. 17, 1951	Speech on floor of House re amendment to H. R. 5113.	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10289-10290.
Apr. 4, 1952	Speech on floor of House re USIS and Voice of America in connection with an affirmative foreign policy.	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3536-3537.
Apr. 28, 1952	Testimony before House Foreign Affairs Committee.....	Hearings on H. R. 7005, pp. 869-882.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the real impediment to the flow of foreign capital from this country to foreign countries the lack of stability of foreign governments?

Mr. MEADER. I think that is an important impediment, but there are others.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. It is true that the impediment is instability. But there is ample room for investment in some other areas that will take 20 times what we are able to do there.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, whether my efforts have had anything to do with it or not, I must say that I believe some progress has been made toward an objective which I regard as being of transcendent importance in developing a sound, vital, effective, and understandable American foreign policy. The administration now appears to have accepted unequivocally the proposition that it should be a part of our foreign policy to promote economic activities of our citizens in the strengthening of the free world. Beyond accepting that objective, however, the efforts of the administration to achieve it have been so puny and ineffective as to raise a doubt of the sincerity of the administration's faith in the validity of the objective they have accepted.

I quote a brief passage from the remarks made by the Secretary of State before the Conference on International Economic and Social Development held here in Washington last April 9:

I have been working for 12 years on the effort to free international trade from some of its barriers and I regret to say that there are as many now as there were when we began and the outlook is discouraging. But we must continue to fight it and you must continue to help us because this matter of freeing trade throughout the world and bringing about a greater exchange of goods is essential for the purpose that you are meeting here today to consider.

Similarly in the economic field there is the matter of investment. Unless there is a climate to encourage investment abroad

you will not get the developments in underdeveloped areas which we are seeking. And unhappily the climate does not seem to be getting better but in many parts of the world to be getting worse. There seems to be an idea that there is something bad about foreign investment in some parts of the world. Companies, people who have put a great deal of money, a great deal of effort into developments in underdeveloped areas are treated as though they were enemies of the country in which they are working. If that goes on it just means that there will not be foreign investment and there will not be, as you all know, governmental capital sufficient to do this job.

Mark this sentence—still Acheson talking:

And, after all, it doesn't make much difference whether the investment is the property of all the citizens of the country or some of the citizens. If the whole climate for the reception of foreign investment in a country is bad, then the capital will not go there, whether it's private or governmental.

I propose to show, and I hope that I can convince the House, that the provisions of the present bill are wholly inadequate. The first witness in support of that proposition is the Secretary of State himself in the passage I have just quoted.

If the Department of State has been working diligently for 12 years to eliminate the barriers to international trade and investment, and we are no further ahead than we were 12 years ago, what hope can we have that directing the State Department, the Mutual Security Agency and the Technical Cooperation Administration to assail these barriers will produce any appreciable results?

In my initial remarks on this subject before the House of Representatives, I said:

I say it is conclusively established that no agency or department of the executive branch of the Government is capable of blue-printing this bold new program. The fact is that there has been no inhibition on such agencies and departments in the past from proposing and, indeed, from carrying into effect any of the steps which will be necessary if the underdeveloped areas are to be developed through the force of American initiative and enterprise.

I believe there are several reasons why Government officials in the executive branch of the Government are incapable of solving the difficult problem of encouraging private investment abroad.

First, I charge that the Department of State and its Foreign Service have failed deplorably to assist and encourage American business activities abroad in the past. In fact, instead of being merely indifferent to American business activities, some foreign officials have sought to discourage them. This is in marked contrast to the support which the British Foreign Office has consistently afforded British enterprises.

Second, the desire of the State Department and the Mutual Security Administration officials to build up the economies of free nations has led them actually to discriminate against American businessmen when they are in competition with foreign enterprises.

Third, there is an attitude in many American officials having important responsibilities in foreign affairs and in foreign aid to prefer Government activities in the economic field to those of private citizens. I question whether many of these officials have any sincere sympathy for, or faith in, the competitive free enterprise system as contrasted with a greater degree of Government control and direction of economic affairs. Empire-building and the natural desire of officials to retain power impels them to prefer Government aid to private investment.

Fourth, the fact is that very little new American money has been invested abroad since the end of the war, with the exception of the petroleum industry, and by far the greatest amount of overseas investment has been in the Western Hemisphere.

I refer again to the sentence in Secretary Acheson's speech which I emphasize as I quoted it:

And, after all, it doesn't make much difference whether the investment is the property of all the citizens of the country or some of the citizens.

Apparently Dean Acheson makes no distinction between the private investment of American citizens and the investment of taxpayers' funds by the Government. This is a socialistic approach, and in my judgment would render the State Department completely incapable of taking concrete steps toward encouraging the investment of private funds.

Acheson's statement is full support for my charge that officials having responsibilities in foreign affairs have no sincere interest in expanding the economic activities of private citizens in the foreign field.

I recognize that the points I have made are sweeping generalities, yet I believe they will be confirmed by anyone not connected with Government agencies who has had any substantial contact with the manner in which the State Department, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and others have been operating in foreign fields since the end of World War II. I base these charges, not on a comprehensive survey which would obviously be impossible for an individual Congressman to make, but on inquiries made by me, both in the United States and in overseas areas where it has been my privilege to travel extensively in connection with official duties. My own findings and experiences have

been confirmed in discussions with, and communications from, others, including foreign representatives of American business concerns and officials of companies having foreign branches or investments.

I dislike to rest a characterization as sweeping as the one I have made on so unsatisfactory an evidentiary basis. I call attention to the effort I have been making for the past year to persuade the Expenditures Committee of the House, of which I am a member, to engage in an investigation of the State Department with the objective of ascertaining—on the basis of a factual inquiry—how effective the State Department has been in discharging its responsibilities in the conduct of our foreign affairs. Any independent, thorough-going investigation of this question seems to have been effectively stymied. Accordingly, any appraisal of State Department performance, as well as the performance of our other overseas agencies, must rest upon individual observations rather than thorough-going inquiries.

If I am correct in my appraisal of the State Department and the other foreign agencies, it is an idle act to entrust them with the duty of removing impediments to private investment abroad. Nothing will happen.

What we need is a new approach. What we need is a penetrating study by individuals who are not responsible for the mistakes, the attitudes, the action, and the nonaction of Government agencies in the past in this field.

We are dealing here with the activities of citizens in their normal economic pursuits. Who should be better qualified to make contributions in this field than those citizens themselves? We need their thinking. We need their experiences. We need the facts they have developed through years of wrestling with these problems. We need their wisdom and their judgment in devising possible avenues of escape from the strait-jacket which now prevents the natural interchange between citizens in economic activities.

No matter how wonderful a blueprint might emerge from the cerebrations of bureaucratic officials, it will not be any good unless it encourages activity on the part of private investors. By its terms, the objective stated in the Mutual Security Act must be accomplished by private citizens in their own voluntary economic efforts. What better assurance of achieving that objective could there be than to permit private citizens to play an important part in the formulation of the program which it will be their major responsibility to carry out?

Mr. Chairman, the basic question involved in the amendment I will propose is how the task can best be accomplished. Everyone is agreed on the objective of removing barriers to private investment overseas. The bill presented by the Foreign Affairs Committee orders the State Department, the Mutual Security Agency and the Technical Cooperation Administration to accomplish that objective. I propose instead that we entrust that task to a special bipartisan commission patterned after the Hoover Commission which will have no other duties or interests than the sole one of

breaking down the barriers now impeding natural economic forces.

Since the commencement of World War II, in lend-lease, in surplus property, gifts and abandonments, in UNRRA and other rehabilitation programs, in the Marshall plan aid, and now in mutual assistance, the taxpayers of this country have contributed well over \$100,000,000,000 to other nations. In contrast with that, the Department of Commerce estimates that total American overseas private investments are in the neighborhood of \$13,000,000,000. It is my belief that the private dollar invested abroad goes much farther toward sound and lasting development of the areas where it is invested than the tax dollar handled on a government-to-government basis. Furthermore, the dollar privately invested does not cost the taxpayer anything. On the contrary, it relieves the tax burden because it creates wealth and broadens the tax base.

In spite of the fact that high taxes in the United States have contributed an element of pressure toward encouraging American citizens to make investments overseas, statistics of the Department of Commerce conclusively prove that the private investment of American capital overseas since World War II has been pitifully small.

Figures I obtained today demonstrate this point. I include a table showing these figures at this point in my remarks:

AMERICAN OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT
MAY 21, 1952.

Estimated figures from Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce. These figures are taken from a survey made by the Department in 1943 and brought up to date. A new survey is expected to be published in a few months. The new figures may be quite different from the ones given below. However, this is the best estimate at present.

United States direct investments in foreign countries (direct meaning United States private investment in controlled enterprises)

End of 1945 (end of war)	
total investments.....	\$8,269,000,000
End of 1950 total investments.....	13,550,000,000
Increase.....	5,181,000,000
End of 1951.....	14,850,000,000
Increase over 1950.....	1,300,000,000

¹ The 1951 figures are rough estimates.

Breakdown of increase (1945-50) between Western Hemisphere and rest of world

WESTERN HEMISPHERE	
Canadian investments:	
1945-49.....	\$900,000,000
1950.....	500,000,000
Total.....	1,400,000,000
Latin American investments:	
1945-49.....	1,800,000,000
1950.....	270,000,000
Total.....	2,070,000,000
Total.....	3,470,000,000
Rest of world.....	1,711,000,000
Total.....	5,181,000,000

Breakdown by industry:	
Petroleum:	
1950.....	4,072,000,000
1945.....	1,538,000,000
Increase.....	2,534,000,000

Mr. Eric Johnston, Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board, called attention to this fact in the following words:

In the backfield of the point 4 team of public-private action, industrial enterprise carries smashing weight. Some idea of its potential may be gleaned from figures recently cited by Mr. Stacy May, economist of the International Basic Economy Corp.

Since the end of the war, according to Mr. May, American private investment abroad has averaged about \$1,000,000,000 a year. This year, it may reach one billion two hundred million, or four-tenths of 1 percent of our national income.

But Great Britain, at the peak of its international economic leadership, put fully 10 percent of its national income into investment abroad. Over a period of 30 years, British foreign capital investment maintained a level of 2½ percent of Britain's national income.

I would not venture to suggest the total that our own capital investment abroad might be expected to reach during the present period of American economic ascendancy. But I agree completely with the estimate of the partners in progress report—that if industrial enterprise is given opportunity, incentive, and reasonable safeguards, the present total can, and will, be doubled.

The fact that American investments abroad have been so insignificant is the best proof that Government agencies alone are incapable of devising effective methods to increase them. Their record of inactivity and ineffectiveness is before us. The Secretary of State has admitted failure.

I have sought briefly to state the reasons for my position. If we are persuaded of the importance of the objective, the magnitude of the problem and the difficulty of solving it, we will not be satisfied to entrust that task to those who already could have solved it if they had had any interest in solving it and possessed the capacity to do so.

Let us give the American people a chance at this problem. A bipartisan commission with six members from private life and four each from the legislative and executive branches of the Government may get somewhere. At least, it is worth trying.

Under leave obtained in the House, I now include the text of my amendment at this point in my remarks:

Amendment to H. R. 7005 proposed by Mr. MEADER: Page 24, strike out line 19 and all that follows down through line 9 on page 26 and insert the following:

"(b) (1) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, through encouraging and facilitating the development of the natural resources of foreign areas by the investment of private capital and eliminating barriers to and providing incentives for engaging in business enterprises in such areas by persons or business organizations who are nonnationals of such areas, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Foreign Areas (hereafter referred to as the 'Commission').

"(2) (A) The Commission shall be composed of 14 members as follows:

"(1) Ten appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government and six from private life;

"(ii) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President; and

"(iii) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

"(B) Of each class of members, not more than one-half shall be from each of the two major political parties.

"(C) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(3) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

"(4) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(5) (A) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(B) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary \$12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(C) The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(6) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(7) The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

"(8) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection (b).

"(9) (A) The Commission shall study and investigate the problem of aiding underdeveloped foreign areas and shall formulate and recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs for carrying out the purposes of this subsection (b).

"(B) The Commission shall report to the President and to the Congress from time to time the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall file its first report within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and annually thereafter.

"(10) (A) The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

"(B) The Commission, or any committee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection (b), hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

"(C) The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

"(D) The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section."

I hope my amendment will be adopted because I believe it is the effective way of accomplishing an important objective.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to follow my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who stated that H. R. 7005 is wise, sound, and unfortunately necessary. I regret to disagree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on assistance to Yugoslavia. Our foreign policy must be consistent with basic beliefs of our Nation. No nation should receive aid if the basic beliefs of that nation destroy the values the United States seeks to achieve and uphold—the rights of private property.

Mr. Chairman, the importance of H. R. 7005, known as the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, cannot be overestimated. It is the implementation of our foreign policy. It is the actual dollar cost authorization of what the United States must spend to help other nations achieve self-security. Indirectly, it is for our own preservation.

The men in the Kremlin have caused this situation. Their actions as aggressors in Korea have caused the whole rearmament program of the west to be put into motion. They do not desire peace. They desire world domination at any cost. Their actions are so well known to all of us.

During our early history, the foreign policy of the United States did not involve dollar cost, but with the realization that there is one world with two conflicting ideologies—the rights of free men versus a slave state—and with the rapid development of the science of war used by aggressor nations, it has become necessary for the United States to develop a foreign policy of international cooperation in order to assure its self-preservation. Historic steps were taken when the United States joined the United Nations; established the ECA program;

enacted the mutual defense pact; initiated the Mutual Security Program; and ratified the North Atlantic Treaty and other regional pacts. These laws and treaties are binding on all branches of the Government. H. R. 7005 represents their implementation.

The bill before us today is the recommendation of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for this foreign assistance program. It is the means taken by the United States in accepting its responsibility as leader of the free world. It is testimonial to the fact that we are the last bulwark of democracy. It is for the mutual benefit of all freemen. It is the expression of the United States that we desire to live in peace with all peoples and governments, but that we are determined to safeguard freedom for ourselves and for other freedom-loving people.

The policy of the United States in giving foreign aid has been based upon self-help and mutual cooperation. I believe that this policy must now be developed into a policy of aid given on a step-by-step basis. The amount of aid should be determined by the progress of the recipient nations in carrying out the agreed objectives. I refer here to United Nations actions, to regional collective organizations such as NATO, and the plans for European unification.

We have taken a broad view of our responsibility. We must demand that other nations and peoples take the same broad view and look beyond their own horizons to work with others who have identical aims. With each nation making its own contribution, there will be no shirking of responsibility and progress toward our common goal will be made with greater ease and dispatch.

The foreign aid program of the United States for this year hinges on two decisive factors. Both involve revolutionary plans and, as a consequence, have been slowed up by national and international obstacles. The first factor involves the conclusion of contractual treaty agreements with the West German Republic, and Great Britain, France, and the United States. This treaty, called the Bonn or provisional peace treaty, recognizes Western Germany as a member of the European community of nations. There is a limited status on West Germany until such time when East and West Germany can be unified.

The second factor is the creation of a European army. It is realized that Germany must play a part in self-defense and in the defense of Europe. In the light of past events, it is deemed safer to have the German army included in the European army rather than have independent national armies.

It was France who suggested the creation of this new Europe. It has long been realized that the unification of Europe, both economically and militarily, is essential if Europe is to survive. The Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, in its report on its mission to Europe last fall, stated bluntly, "Europe must unite or perish." In his farewell message to Europe, General Eisenhower stated less bluntly that there can be neither peace nor security for Europe unless it unites.

European unity is a necessity—an urgent necessity—of long-range importance. Its primary aim is not merely military in order to build up a defensive strength and to form a barrier against Russia's overwhelming ambitions. It is a compelling necessity for economic reasons. Europe cannot prosper under separate national economies which are unable to compete in world markets against the vast industrial systems built up in the United States and in Russia.

The hope for this unification is stressed in the amendment to section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 which we are considering. The Congress welcomes the recent progress in political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe and reaffirms its belief in the necessity of further vigorous efforts toward these ends as a means of building strength, establishing security, and preserving peace in the North Atlantic area. In order to provide further encouragement to such efforts, the Congress believes it essential that this act should be so administered as to support concrete measures for political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe.

It is difficult to understand the slowness in arriving at this goal of unity, since its importance has been recognized by the representatives of those nations. However, we must bear in mind that there are many traditions, customs, language barriers, and historical factors to be overcome.

I believe that much of this obstruction would be eased if Great Britain had been willing to be a partner. The explanation for her refusal is that it would weaken her ties with the Commonwealth countries. That seems to me to be a poor excuse. She is not being asked to choose between the Commonwealth and Europe. England has had other alliances which did not weaken her ties.

Diplomatically, this represents a complete change with the past. The whole equilibrium of the twentieth century was based upon an alliance between France and England. In the present plan, unification or federation will revolve around Germany and France. It is to be hoped that a plan can be devised so that this new Europe can bring about and defend the peace.

The United States has done, and will continue to do, her share. The world should know that our only interest is to benefit the free world, to do all we can to help other nations to be self-sustaining and militarily strong. We ask the cooperation of others toward this aim. It is not a one-way responsibility.

The time for hesitation is past. Now is the time for the Western Powers to move ahead and to sustain the forces and plans jointly initiated and sponsored. It is time for us to prove to the nations whom we are aiding that we want no further bargaining. The haggling within Germany, instigated by the Socialist Party led by Herr Schumacher, is regretted. This opposition, augmented by Russian counterproposals, aligns them with the Kremlin. This comes as no surprise to me. This thinking was

very evident to me when I was in Germany last fall. Powerful, threatening forces are in the background and, despite Chancellor Adenauer's courageous stand and diplomatic patience, the Socialists, inspired by the Russians, hope to upset the plans of the free world.

A swift realization of the Schuman plan and a quick conclusion of the European Defense Community Pact are the only means for keeping the resources, factories, and skills of Europe free from Soviet control. For that reason, the major portion of H. R. 7005 is earmarked for Europe.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House many noteworthy changes in H. R. 7005.

Section 2: Adopted Senate language of section 2 which authorizes assistance to three designated organizations for unifying Europe rather than to any such organization as provided in H. R. 7005 as introduced.

This change shows the hope and desire for the new Europe implementation of NATO, European coal and steel unification, creation of a European defense community.

Section 3: Amended Mutual Security Act to mention Spain by name as eligible to receive assistance—was eligible previously.

Spain was made eligible for participation in the aid program over a year ago and as yet has not received any assistance. This section includes Spain as part of the pattern for defense in the west.

Military end items in title I are \$3,316,000,000—cut \$829,000,000 from \$4,145,000,000. This is the amount we recommend should be authorized for matériel to supply the European NATO countries under the Lisbon plan. The United States must deliver the major portion of the equipment. Europe must provide the bulk of the forces.

Cut defense support 10 percent from \$1,819,200,000 to \$1,637,300,000—cut \$181,900,000—page 48. To further assist these countries, it is necessary that we authorize \$1,637,300,000 for defense support. Call this any term you want—economic aid. Its purpose is to supply raw materials for arms manufactured in Europe. It is the estimated amount needed to assist European countries to divert their industry to defense production. It is to cushion the impact of their arms program. Together these authorizations will assist Europe in meeting its share of the collective rearmament cost of seventeen and seven-tenths billion.

Only through this cooperative effort can there be achieved promptly a build-up of defense strength providing a genuine deterrent to aggression. To cut defense support—cuts the number of men in European forces. I do not support any further cuts in this title but I do believe that this assistance should be given only as the European nations progress toward our mutual objectives.

Retained the authority to transfer 10 percent within title I rather than the 5 percent proposed in H. R. 7005.

Earmarked not less than \$25,000,000 for Spain.

Section 4: No alteration of amounts in title II—Near East and Africa—but

adopted the Senate form of authorization by specifying the funds for Arab refugees and for refugees coming to Israel and for technical assistance in that area.

Section 5: Struck out exemption of title III funds from section 503 of MSA. This means that TCA will have to take over from MSA the programs in Burma and Indonesia.

Section 6: Redesignated area as American republics and non-self-governing territories of the Western Hemisphere.

Provided that no part of the United States contribution to the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe could be used to pay salary or expenses of the Director General of such Committee if a former employee of UNRRA or IRO.

Section 7: MSA Act amended to authorize distribution of 50 super grades already provided among all departments and agencies covered in the program. Some of these may be assigned to point 4 and Defense.

Required by July 1, 1952, a 10 percent reduction—based on January 1, 1952, personnel—of personnel other than blue-collar workers and technical consultants.

Director of Mutual Security required to reduce reporting requirements.

Authorized the transfer of not more than \$1,000,000,000 of military items from United States defense program to foreign nations in addition to equipment authorized by this bill.

Required that not less than \$1,000,000,000 be earmarked exclusively for offshore procurement. My reason for offshore procurement is that other countries must gear to produce their own weapons. We must not tie up or limit United States industry to defense mobilization and permit other nations to usurp world markets.

Authorized total expenditure of not more than \$100,000,000, not more than \$20,000,000 to any country, without conditions as to eligibility. This would permit giving limited assistance to nations which we wish to help but which may be afraid to enter into agreements with us.

Authorized Director for Mutual Security to develop strategic materials in world deficiency for countries receiving United States assistance.

The Director for Mutual Security required to take suitable and appropriate steps to assure effective use by recipient countries of their own resources for mutual security.

Provided up to \$1,000,000,000 of counterpart to encourage free enterprise.

Permitted up to \$100,000,000 of military production and economic and technical-assistance funds to be used for subscribing to capital of an International Finance Corporation.

Investment and informational media guaranties continued after June 30, 1952, to all areas where United States assistance is granted.

Required Mutual Security Agency to develop broad criteria for guaranties and to conduct study of impediments to private investment abroad; Department

of State required to accelerate commercial and tax-treaty program; Technical Cooperation Administration required to encourage and facilitate greater participation by industrial groups in point 4 programs and to bring investment opportunities in underdeveloped areas to attention of private enterprise.

Section 9: Required counterpart funds used for loans by recipient countries to be redeposited in counterpart special account when loans are repaid so as to give the United States continuing participation in their administration.

Assured that counterpart fund be available for strategic materials without regard to 5 percent limitation.

Section 11: Authorized \$12,000,000 for UNICEF for period ending December 31, 1953, on condition that United States contribution not exceed one-third of contribution from all governments. None of the activities for which these funds are authorized shall duplicate any of the activities of other U. N. agencies.

CONCLUSION

The world is once again at the crossroads. Decisions made this week and next, both here and in Europe, will change the course of history. No matter how large the sums of money involved in this bill, they are small compared to the goal for which we are striving. The political federation of European countries, built upon a unified economic foundation where the laboring classes are dignified by receiving a just income, will form a wall through which the false inducements of communism will not penetrate.

Therefore, I urge the passage of this bill to support Europe toward our objectives in this time of great decision. Directly, this will prove to friend and foe that the United States cooperates constructively toward peace and security.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration today H. R. 7005, a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951. I wish to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Affairs for at least bringing in a bill as an amendment to the one passed a little over 7 months ago, rather than under a new name. Of course, it might be somewhat embarrassing to change the name when the law has not been in effect for a full year.

When this program was originally presented to Congress it was called interim aid, then the Marshall plan, then the European recovery program, now the Mutual Security Act, and I would not be surprised to see the bill next year entitled "Point 4 Assistance Program."

Regardless of what you call it, it means the distribution of wealth of the United States to the four corners of the world.

Before the House of Representatives takes action on the present bill, H. R. 7005, I would like to give the Committee the benefit of my observations and findings for its consideration in passing upon the authorization of \$7,900,000,000 as recommended by President Truman for the mutual-security program for fiscal year 1953.

During my investigation last year in Europe I checked into how our Marshall plan and ECA funds were being expended.

ENGLAND

The first place I stopped was England. While there I talked with members of the ECA mission from the United States, leaders of both the Labor and Conservative Parties, some of whom are at present in the Cabinet of Great Britain, as well as the shopkeeper, businessman, and the average man on the street. I discussed our Marshall plan and its benefits to them. I was greatly surprised to learn that the average Englishman knew very little, if anything, about what the American taxpayers' money was doing for his country and the total amount that had been appropriated. It was indeed a great disappointment to me to learn that the men in the British Government, while admitting that our funds had done a great deal of good for them economically after the cessation of hostilities in World War II, were damning us in the same breath. We were almost universally accused by members of both the Conservative and Labor Parties for nearly all of their troubles.

Representatives of ECA in London showed me a graph that was being prepared showing the agricultural production in England had increased 40 percent since the war. Naturally, I asked them what was responsible for it. I was immediately informed that it was due to our Marshall plan aid. I told them that I had been advised the grazing land of England had been reduced since World War II from approximately 58 to 41 percent, and I imagined it was just reasonable to assume that a portion of that 18-percent reduction in grazing land had been put into arable land. While they agreed with me in my assumption, I regret they were not able to show me where they had taken that factor into consideration in making their graph.

Anyone will acknowledge that the economy of Great Britain could not have helped being restored to some extent with all the money we gave her, but I cannot help but feel the people of Great Britain should have been advised as to what we have done to help her. Whenever I asked our representatives in England why the English people were not fully informed about what we are doing for them, I generally got the reply that the British are very proud people, and we could not afford to offend their pride.

The conservative leaders blamed our Marshall plan dollars for keeping the Labor government in power. They contended that if we had not given Great Britain so much money, thereby keeping the Labor government in power, they would not have been saddled with the socialist program of nationalizing their industries. The conservative leaders also poo-pooed the information that has been put out by the State Department that if they had not kept the Labor Party in power England might have had a form of government worse than that of the Labor government. Of course, there is no proof that they would have had something worse, while on the other

hand, there is always the possibility they could have had something better if the conservatives had been returned to power at an earlier date.

Mr. Chairman, I was in England a second time last year, just prior to the general elections which were held on October 25. For several evenings prior to the elections I made it my business to go out and listen to speakers for both the Conservative and Labor Parties. As a matter of fact, two nights before the elections I traveled with Mr. Clement Attlee and listened to his arguments in favor of the Labor Party. The afternoon before the elections I traveled with Mr. Churchill to listen to him. It was very interesting to see that at the conclusion of every talk Mr. Churchill held up his right arm with the famous V for victory. In every instance he never forgot to close his remarks with "And for dear old England." It made one admire a man of his position, who, all through the years had contributed so much to his country and at the conclusion of his remarks expressed his love for his native land in such a splendid manner. I would to God that we had more Americans who thought as much of the United States.

I hold in my hand 128 clippings of various newspapers of Great Britain, including 14 of the Daily Worker, the official Communist paper, in which are recorded the views of the various candidates for office during the general election campaign. They include such men as the following members of the Labor Party:

Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, Minister of Defense.

Mr. Henderson, Secretary of State for Air.

Mr. Herbert Morrison, Foreign Secretary.

Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Sir Hartley Sharncross, President of the Board of Trade.

Mr. Naevvin Bevin, recognized leader of the radical block in the Labor Party.

Mr. Clement Attlee, Prime Minister.

Mr. Strachey, Secretary of State for War.

Mr. Robens, Minister of Labor.

Mr. Webb, Minister of Food.

Mr. P. C. Gordon-Walker, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations.

Mr. Stokes, Lord Privy Seal.

Lord Jawitt, Lord Chancellor.

In addition to those of the Labor Party you will find among these clippings reports of speeches of such well-known people of the Conservative Party as Winston Churchill, Anthony Eden, Sir John Anderson, Lord Woolton, and Sir David Fyfe.

Also, you will find reports of speeches by leaders of the Communist and Liberal Parties. The reason I bring this to your attention while we have under discussion the mutual security bill is because not a single speaker of any party made mention of or gave credit to the United States for what it has done for Great Britain in aid, with the exception of one occasion. Mr. Anthony Eden, speaking at Old Milverton, Warwick-

shire, on October 21, 1951, in reply to many criticisms that had been leveled at the United States, said:

The critics of the United States were ungenerous.

Since returning from England I have repeatedly stated in my numerous lectures that in my opinion the Labor Party had no desire to actually win the election last October. It appeared that they wanted the Conservative Party to win by a small margin but not enough to have a dependable working majority, with the hope and the knowledge that the Conservative Party could not possibly bring Great Britain out of her economic dilemma. The reasoning was that at the next general election the Labor Party would be returned to power with a very large working majority which it did not have in the last Parliament. Frankly, in my opinion, the Labor Party engineered the economy of Great Britain into such a tangled and helpless condition that the Conservative Party will not be able to fulfill its promises made in the campaign, and the Labor Party will be returned to power at the next general election with a much larger majority than it previously had in Parliament.

Lest someone might say that I had purposely selected certain reports of speeches in this collection of only those which did not give credit to the United States for what the taxpayers had contributed to the economic well-being of England, I wish to state that this entire file of news clippings was compiled for me in the United States Embassy in London. This was done that I might know what the various candidates and leaders of the political parties were saying in the campaign, and particularly as to their attitude toward giving credit to the United States for our aid. As a matter of fact, listening to Clement Attlee two nights before the general election he made a great deal about the fact that industrial production in England had increased 50 percent since the war but did not hesitate to emphasize that credit for the entire 50 percent increase was due to Labor and the Labor Party alone. It is easy for anyone to appreciate the fact that after the factories, public works, transportation, and everything else had taken a terrible beating during the war, and production, naturally, was at a very low mark, it would have to improve—even without any aid from the United States.

The British, and particularly members of the Labor Party, blame us for all their troubles in Iran. It came to me as a surprise to find the people of England did not blame the Labor Party at all for the troubles in Iran but only the Americans. On every occasion I received the same explanation, to wit: If the Americans had not gone into Saudi Arabia and Iraq and made contracts with the Government wherein they received fair profits for the oil taken out of those countries, the British could have continued to take oil out of Iran on the basis of their original contracts. These

were made many years ago and gave the Iranian Government very little compensation for the oil that they extracted from that country. In most instances I was told the Iranian Government was only receiving a 10-percent royalty from the British companies, while the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Iraq received approximately 50 percent royalty on oil. The Iranian Government asked Great Britain to renegotiate their contracts, which the British positively refused to do. They insisted that the Iranian Government live up to the old contract that was made many years ago which was very unfavorable to Iran in comparison with the American contracts in Iraq and Saudi Arabia. After the British refused to talk about renegotiating the contracts with Iran, the Iranian Government served notice that they would expropriate the British oil properties and nationalize the oil industry in Iran. Although the Labor Government of Great Britain registered a protest against this procedure, it was an ineffective one, in view of the fact that they had just completed nationalizing practically all of the industries in Great Britain. Furthermore, the Iranian Government had precedence for its action because it was only 12 or 13 years ago that the Mexican Government expropriated all the American oil properties in that country. In return it gave the American companies only about 10 cents on the dollar for the investment they had made in building up the oil industry of Mexico.

Outside of Government officials in Great Britain, another startling discovery was that I found no one who had the slightest idea that the greater portion of the 95 percent of our Marshall plan aid known as counterpart funds had been applied directly to reduce the national debt of Great Britain. Members of the Conservative Party pointed to this as one of the main reasons the United States was responsible for the British industries being nationalized as a result of keeping the Labor Party in power for so long.

FRANCE

One of the greatest mistakes the Economic Cooperation Administration made in many European countries, and particularly in France, was that we should have insisted that the Government collect the just taxes from its people before we gave a dollar in Marshall aid. During my two visits to France last year, I made it a point to talk with many people in various types of business. Invariably they informed me that in their opinion the French Government was not collecting within 50 percent of the taxes that should have gone into the treasury. Personally, I believe it would be more correct to say that the French Government only collects 25 percent of the taxes it should. I take the stand that we should have insisted that they correct this evil before any aid whatsoever was given to them. Not that I wish to betray any confidences regarding tax collection, but I was informed that in reality almost every busi-

nessman was carrying the tax collector on his payroll in one form or another.

The most popular game in France seems to be one government falling after another, due to the fact that every premier wants to be sure he doesn't offend any political party or the various splinters of political parties. No one to date has been willing or had the courage to tell the French people the truth about their economic and financial conditions and institute remedies to put their government on a sound basis.

I was informed that approximately 1,000,000 people have been added to the civil payrolls and that once a person is on the payroll it is next to impossible to dismiss him. This is one of the reasons the government-owned French railroads run at such large deficits every year.

Mr. Chairman, if you do not agree that a large portion of the hard earned money of the American taxpayer is going down the sewer, listen to this. The French Government actually subsidizes the Communist-dominated and controlled French trade-unions. A portion of this is our money because for years we have been pumping money into France. This, mind you, is money that the Congress of the United States has appropriated to stop and contain communism.

One of the most flagrant examples of waste of American taxpayers' money in the form of Marshall aid to France has been in rebuilding the French railroads. In numerous instances spurs and branch lines of the French railroad system were rebuilt, including stations and bridges where, for many years, there has been practically no traffic and no revenue. They were only rebuilt because of the influence of local politicians when the communities should not only be served by, but have been and are being served by busses and trucks. These obsolete lines should have been scrapped years ago, the same as we permit railroads to discontinue service and abandon road beds in the United States for economy and efficiency. These branch lines of the French railway system are responsible for tremendous deficits in operating expenses each year.

The French, like most Europeans, think we are crazy to keep pouring the American taxpayers' dollars into the economy of European countries and, in my opinion, they will never knuckle down to business and help themselves to the extent they should as long as they know they are going to get hand-outs from Uncle Sam.

BELGIUM

In all fairness I must report that I believe the ECA mission in Belgium has done a better job of educating the people of the country as to what we have done for them under the Marshall plan, and its effects, than in any other country I visited last summer. Unlike England, the men in charge of our Marshall plan aid in Belgium were able to produce their records, radio script, and newspaper articles, to prove that they had done everything within their power to let the people know exactly what we have done for them. The people were appreciative.

They were not too proud to be told that we had come to their economic aid.

The Belgian people as a whole seemed industrious and were working hard. The results showed it. In my opinion, the economy of Belgium is in better condition than any country in Europe, with the exception of Switzerland.

It was, however, rather difficult for me to determine whether the agricultural program as followed by the ECA in Belgium or the one followed in Italy was correct. Over a long period of years the large farms of Belgium, having been handed down to heirs, have been divided so many times that the average size of many farms in Belgium today is around 10 acres. The program of the ECA in Belgium is to consolidate these farms into large ones, whereby it would be economical to use improved mechanized methods of farming.

For fear someone might get the impression that the people who are on these small farms must eke out a living from them, I wish to state that in most cases the people who work them have employment in industry and take care of the farms evenings, week ends, and in their spare time.

However, in Italy I found the ECA's agricultural program was just the opposite of what it was in Belgium. In the southern part of Italy there are many large estates that for years have not been put into production. Instead of using modern, mechanized methods on these large estates to produce food, ECA was splitting them up into small farms, the average size of which is about 10 acres. This will make it impossible to use mechanized equipment on them. In other words, they are establishing a program in Italy which is diametrically opposite to that in operation in Belgium.

COMMUNISM

In every country I visited I went into the question of whether communism is on the decrease or on the increase. My reason for doing this was because the billions upon billions of dollars which have been appropriated for aid under the Marshall plan were obtained from Congress because we have been assured time and again that it is for the purpose of stopping and containing communism. Unfortunately, it has done neither. This is particularly true in France and Italy, where communism is more prevalent today than at any time since the cessation of hostilities at the end of World War II. Nevertheless, the record does show that communism has been on the decrease in Belgium. I was expressly anxious to learn why it had decreased there and not in other European countries. I had the privilege of having a long discussion with Mr. Finet, the general secretary of the General Federation of Trade Unions in Belgium, whom I found to be a very well-informed man, not only on matters of labor but also on economy and government.

After my conference with Mr. Finet I had a long visit with the Minister of Justice on the very same subject. It is the responsibility of the Minister of Justice in Belgium to keep a check on all

radical elements within the country—especially Communists. He is recognized as one of the best authorities in Belgium on the subject of communism. His explanation was the same as that of Mr. Finet. They both told me that during the war, when Russia was considered our ally, the Communists in Belgium did very effective work in what was known as the underground. These Communists were not Russians or natives of any foreign country, but Belgian nationals. As such they were either given or obtained far more recognition than they deserved. They were made members of the Belgian Cabinet and were given many high offices in the government. Because of their aggressiveness, propaganda, and organizational methods, they were able to deceive the Belgian people regarding their true objectives and thereby received support at the polls, which enabled them to be elected to various public offices. But after the truth of Yalta, Potsdam, Tehran, and the Korean war became known to the Belgian people, and they learned the truth about communism, they have been repudiating the Communists at the polls more and more each election. Therefore, the Communists have been receiving fewer votes each election.

ITALY

Mr. Chairman, after my survey of the operations of ECA in Italy I was rather curious to ascertain the qualifications of Mr. Mildren L. Dayton, the man in complete charge of ECA operations in that country. As a result, when I returned to Paris, I took occasion to check his application for employment. I was quite surprised to learn, at least in my judgment, that he had no qualifications whatsoever for such a responsible position. I challenge anyone to prove that he did. According to his application he had been employed by the international division of the American Red Cross in civilian relief from May 3, 1943, until the last of May in 1947, when he filed his application for employment with the Department of State. Incidentally, he was recruited for this position by the State Department because on his application he stated his reason for changing employment was at the request of the State Department. At the time he was employed by the American Red Cross, his application shows that he received a salary of \$2,400 per year. At the time he presented his application for employment to the State Department he was receiving \$4,800 per year, plus full maintenance. Is it any wonder that our entire Marshall aid program has been such a complete failure when a man whose only qualification was that he supervised and distributed packages and participated in civilian relief was put in charge of such an important phase of the program as Italy?

I was told in Rome, Italy, that Mr. Dayton's salary for ECA was \$15,000 per year, plus a limousine with a private chauffeur, plus a home and servants, plus a cost-of-living allowance and an unlimited expense account.

The ECA in Rome occupies a large office building almost across the street

from the Embassy. As I left the building one day at the lunch hour I noticed approximately 15 automobiles with chauffeurs around the building. In a few minutes the employees poured from the building into the waiting automobiles and away they went. A short time before the 2-hour lunch period was up I was again in the vicinity and observed the returning automobiles. The employees entered the building while the cars and chauffeurs waited. I mention this for two reasons: First, because the ECA building is in the best location in Rome for bus, streetcar, and taxi transportation; secondly, I consider it an unjustified waste of the taxpayers' money. Excellent restaurant facilities are available in the immediate vicinity.

I do not believe the man over here who carries his lunch in a dinner pail is going to like that. He figures his kids need shoes with the tax money Uncle Sam collects from him a lot more than ECAers need a chauffeur and a leisurely ride to get a 2-hour snack. This is only one instance. I can just imagine the resentment among the working men and women of America over this so-called foreign-aid program if there were some way of bringing the entire story to their attention.

Time will not permit me to go into detail on everything in Italy, let alone some of the various other countries, but let us just for a moment look at one or two situations there. I am sure they are quite representative of how our giveaway program of the taxpayers' money has been administered in most of the countries receiving this form of aid.

Mr. Chairman, I want you and the Members of this body to keep in mind that our fundamental and primary objective in this program, according to statements from President Truman, Dean Acheson, and other officials of our Government, has been to stop and contain communism. The man in charge of the ECA Information Program for Italy was one Frank H. Gervasi. Under his misguidance, insistence and direction, 3 concerts were put on to stop communism. These concerts were held in Lucca, Bari, and Rome. So-called artists were imported from all over the world at tremendous salaries and expense accounts and were accompanied by a 65-piece orchestra. The comptroller of ECA funds in Italy informed me that the total cost of these concerts was 18,500,000 lira. When I returned to Paris I checked with the general comptroller of ECA for all of Europe to see what his figures showed. He informed me that the 3 concerts cost 23,500,000 lira. Mind you, this is just the actual expense and does not take into account the time and expense of our large personnel in ECA in Italy and many other items that were not directly charged to the concerts. I shudder to even hazard a guess what the overall cost of these 3 concerts might have been because of the shocking effect it might have on our systems. At any rate, it would be interesting if the

full truth about them could be brought out some day.

We all know and appreciate that the Italian people are world renowned for their love of music and for their musical talent. When Mrs. Busbey and I were in Milan we were fortunate enough to get tickets to a concert conducted by the great Victor DeSabata and complemented by a chorus of more than 200 voices. Mrs. Busbey was at one time a concert violinist and we both have on many occasions enjoyed fine concerts in the United States, but I am frank to say in all sincerity that this particular concert was by far the best I had ever had the pleasure of hearing.

Mr. Chairman, on numerous occasions I have asked many people what they thought these 3 concerts had to do with stopping communism. I have yet to have anyone give me a satisfactory answer to that question. To illustrate how ineffective our programs have been in combating communism, let me give you one of the most effective means the Communists have of recruiting favorable opinion to them, particularly in Italy.

In nearly every village there is a small park with a bandstand. The Communists hire a very few pieces of music and invite all the people of the village down to the square to dance and have an enjoyable evening. During the evening they serve the natives free beer and sandwiches and everybody goes home happy and feeling kindly toward the Communists, because they know the Communists did something for them. Whenever the Communists do anything for the people of any of these villages, everyone in the village knows that the Communists did it. Mr. Chairman, I am not advocating free beer and sandwiches. I am merely reciting the facts to illustrate the point that for peanuts, as far as money is concerned, the Communists put over an effective program where our billions have failed.

The people of Italy would be much better off if the money that was spent on these three concerts had been used to build a playground in some slum area so that the children could have obtained benefit. This would have been worth while and everyone would have known that America did it for the people of that area.

As in the case of Mr. Dayton, I was rather interested in the background of Mr. Frank H. Gervasi, who was in charge of the information program for ECA in Italy. When I returned to Paris I looked over his application form for Federal employment. After viewing the names of his reference it was quite understandable to me, at least in part, why our ECA information program in Italy was a complete failure as far as combating communism is concerned. The references given by Mr. Gervasi on the application form in the Paris office were as follows: William Shirer, Leland Stowe, Cornelia Bryce Pinchot, Ralph Hetzel, Nelson Perry.

Mr. Chairman, William L. Shirer, Cornelia Bryce Pinchot, Ralph Hetzel, and

Leland Stowe have been affiliated with several organizations designated by the Attorney General as Communist. Mr. Gervasi's application should not have been considered under any circumstances in view of his references, particularly because of the objectives of the ECA organization which we were told were to combat and stop communism through economic aid. Is it any wonder that our European aid program has failed and the taxpayers' money in most instances wasted and the entire operation correctly named "operation rat-hole."

RAILROADS IN ITALY

During my inspection trip in Europe I used many modes of transportation. I drove approximately 4,000 miles by automobile, in some cases I used commercial airplanes, but in Italy my traveling was done entirely by train. I will not try to tell of my experiences by train because they are beyond description. Even pictures could not do justice. Frankly, it seemed like the entire population of Italy was trying to get on the particular train I was riding. The old expression "packed in like sardines" would not begin to describe the number of people who tried to travel in each railroad car. This method of travel permitted me to observe the railroad stations in the small towns and villages of Italy. I was greatly impressed with the beautiful, modern, up-to-date railroad station in every town. A great deal of our Marshall plan money has gone into building these new stations. While I do not begrudge the Italian people these beautiful, new, modernistic railroad stations, I could not help but compare them to our modest little stations in small towns throughout America and wondered what our people would think if they could see what their hard-earned tax dollars had built for the people of Italy.

The station in Rome is by far the most modernistic station in the world. It is reasonable to say that it is three times larger than the traffic warrants at the present time. It will be many, many years in the future before they will ever have the capacity to utilize such a large station. As long as they had the ground for the station they could have built a portion of it now and the rest when the traffic demanded it.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact it is common knowledge that the businessmen and industrial firms of Italy, as in France, keep two sets of books—in most cases three—and it is impossible to get an accurate profit-and-loss statement or balance sheet, I was interested to determine what method was used by the Finance Division of our ECA mission in Italy to ascertain what company should be granted a loan in preference to another. I had quite a long conversation with Miss Anne R. Friedman, Finance Analyst of the Finance Division, as well as other members of the committee. When we finished, it all boiled down to the fact that they did not have any dependable information on which to base their grants but relied on a committee

in the Italian Government known as IMI. I am sure if one could delve into the situation he would find that many industrial concerns of Italy are receiving ECA financial grants which, in reality, do not need them. It is certainly no secret that tremendous wealth is leaving Italy and France to be invested in Africa and South America, a great deal of it going untaxed.

AMBASSADORS

A very embarrassing thing which has been brought about because of our Marshall plan in Europe is that not only ECA but other missions give our officials the rank of Ambassador. It seems every time we appoint a chairman of some mission to Europe he is sent over there with the rank of Ambassador, to say nothing of our regular Ambassadors who represent our Government and also our roving Ambassadors. In fact, it is quite embarrassing to people who call the Embassy and ask to speak to the Ambassador to have the person answering the telephone inquire, "To which Ambassador do you wish to speak?" For the sake of eliminating a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding, bickering as to protocol at social functions, and so forth, we should discontinue the use of the term "ambassador" in connection with everyone in our missions and confine it to the accredited Ambassador for the State Department. I contend that we should have one Ambassador, and only one, in these various countries.

DISMANTLING IN GERMANY

While I propose to make a detailed report at a later date on the Morgenthau dismantling program in Germany, I wish to state in passing that the reason we are spending money in Germany, under the Marshall plan, is in part due to the fact that we let the British and Russians dismantle the factories of Germany and we are now called upon to furnish the money to rebuild them. It would have been bad enough if the program had been confined to dismantling, but I saw factories where the British just ruined the machinery with tremendous acetylene torches without any attempt to dismantle them. If any program could have been handled worse than the situation since Roosevelt recognized Marxist Russia in 1933, it is the dismantling and occupation program of Germany.

Because we fell for the so-called Morgenthau program, which in reality was the brain child of Mr. Morgenthau's assistant, Harry D. White, who has been identified by Elizabeth Bentley as connected with a Communist cell within a Government agency, all of which has never been disproved, plus the fact that we have let the British make the Administration agree to a plan not to let Germany produce, the American taxpayers are again being called upon to put up untold millions to maintain the economy of Western Germany. I talked to many Germans in various sections of Germany and everyone told me they would not need Marshall or any other kind of aid if the United States would let them pro-

duce many items needed for the Western European defense program, including steel. Every industrial man I interviewed in Germany assured me all that was needed was a loan to be amortized over a period of 10 years.

With the shortage of steel it seemed almost like treason to find one of Germany's largest steel mills permitted to operate at only 5 percent capacity, especially in view of the fact that when I was in Frankfurt there was a teletype conference between our State Department and the Steel Board in Germany to determine the possibilities of getting 100,000 tons of steel from Germany to replace the steel lost in the Kansas floods in the spring of 1951. How stupid can we get? No one but the bright boys in the State Department would think up such an inane question under conditions at that time.

SPAIN

Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word regarding the situation in Spain before I conclude. I believe this is one of the most misunderstood and mishandled problems in Europe. I must say the Communists in the United States have done an effective job in distorting the actual facts. In my conversations with the high-ranking members of the Spanish Government, I asked them what their attitude was toward coming into the NATO program. The answer I received was always the same, "We have not been invited and until we are invited there is nothing to talk about." It was a true answer to my question and I am thoroughly convinced that the reason Spain has not been invited into the NATO program is due in a large part to the economic objections from England and France and the well-planted propaganda by the Communists and their fellow travelers.

I cannot speak for others, but the State Department will never do a very good job convincing me that they are sincere in their attempts to contain and stop communism until they make use of all the anti-Communist forces there are in the world—which includes Western Germany, Spain, and the Chinese Nationalists.

In many instances when I talked to our representatives abroad about bringing Spain into the defense of Western Europe program, they would throw up their hands in horror and want to know if I thought we should have any traffic with a vicious dictator like Franco. While I do not approve of a dictatorship under any circumstances or conditions, I do know that the Spanish people are definitely anti-Communist and they could put an army of 1,000,000 violently anti-Communist, well-trained, hard-fighting men into the field in a period of approximately 4 months.

The inconsistency in the policy of the State Department is that we have been using the taxpayers' money for years to support dictators, particularly in Central and South America, to say nothing of a Communist dictator in Yugoslavia by the name of Tito. This is understandable when one realizes that since the New

Deal has come into power the United States has never had a definite foreign policy. We wait until Soviet Russia acts and then we react. We wait until she moves and then we make a countermove. The unfortunate part about it all is that the countermoves that we make are feeble, ineffective, costly, and while we are bleeding ourselves white economically and forcing America into bankruptcy, the Communists go forward with their program of communizing millions and millions of additional people each year and bringing them under the domination and control of Marxist Russia.

If all the anti-Communist manpower that is available were utilized it would not be necessary for the United States to have a single division of American soldiers in Europe. Oh yes, I appreciate the fact that every time a congressional delegation goes out to General Eisenhower's headquarters it is given the usual treatment on what a great thing the presence of the American soldiers has been to boost the morale of the European people. But that is not as I found it when I was over there and talked with people on the highways and byways. As a matter of fact, they resent very much our soldiers being over there and are fearful that we intend to get them into another war and cause their cities and homes to be bombed and the lives of many of their people lost.

To the credit of Spain it must be said that notwithstanding the fact that she has always been one of the poorest countries of Europe and endured a civil war to defeat communism, she has made a remarkable recovery without the help of Marshall plan money.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying, "put the oil where the squeak is," and the squeak in this instance is in the lap of the Democratic administration because they and they alone are responsible for world conditions as they are today.

The Congress could vote 10 times as much money as the administration is asking for under this so-called mutual security program and it would not stop communism. Communism is an ideology and you cannot stop an ideology with money or all the weapons and atom bombs in the world. The only way we can defeat an ideology is with a better one and the proper technique and personnel to sell it to the peoples of the world. We have the best ideology and system of government in the world but, unfortunately, the program that the administration has pursued has been a dismal failure and we are in a mess because of it.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, by wasting the resources of the United States we are playing right into the hands of Joe Stalin. We must change the give-away policy of the administration or face the future as a bankrupt nation. At the present time the initiative is held by Stalin and we will never be able to obtain it until we have a positive program administered by men who not only know communism, but are capable of effectively fighting it.

Who is coming to our rescue after we have dissipated our resources? We have reached a point where there is not a single nation we can depend upon in a final show-down. Every time we appropriate five or ten billion dollars for foreign aid every nation is angry because it did not receive a bigger share of the pie.

On May 5 to 7 of this year the State Department held a national conference on United States foreign policy where representatives from 60 to 70 organizations were indoctrinated with the State Department policy in pushing its present foreign-aid bill. The delegates were instructed to go back into their communities and organizations, spread the gospel for foreign aid and whip up sentiment in favor of the bill we have before us for consideration. No one can argue the fact that it would be impossible to throw these billions of dollars into various countries without helping their economy to some extent, but when they are back on their feet, what then?

The people in the State Department realize that the various European countries will reach a stage of overproduction soon. They will then propose to have Congress vote additional billions to take the production off their hands and sustain tremendous losses in an attempt to effect what they call stabilization of world economy. It is the hope of the State Department that the point 4 program will be carried on indefinitely and eventually transferred to the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, little do the people realize that the give-away program of the New Deal has cost the American taxpayers since July 1, 1940, a total of \$122,747,400,306, including fiscal 1952 appropriations. If the Congress should authorize the full amount requested in H. R. 7005 for fiscal 1953 in the amount of \$6,901,100,000, it will bring the total up to nearly \$130,000,000,000. This figure will be startling to many people but it will be more startling to them when they realize that this does not include moneys appropriated for our own Department of Defense.

Looking at the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that accompanied H. R. 7005, I call your attention to line 5 on pages 30 and 31—expenditure data. You will find that as of February 29 of this year, according to this report, there was an unexpended balance for military assistance of \$9,471,537,373 and an unexpended balance for economic and technical assistance of \$11,760,919,050, or a total of \$21,232,456,423 of foreign aid already appropriated by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, sooner or later this entire give-away program must of necessity come to an end. I do not know of a better time than right now when there is an unexpended balance in excess of \$21,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one sure way of losing friends, whether individuals or nations, it is to meddle in other people's business. We have at the present time nearly 100 missions of one kind or another telling people all over the

world what they should and should not do. It is only natural that they should resent our interference with their habits and customs just as we would resent some other country interfering with ours. We should stop this meddling in other people's business and trying to make them over into the image of the New Deal before it is too late. It is a well-known fact that you cannot buy friendship with money.

Mr. Chairman, because the foreign-aid program of the administration has not been successful in containing or stopping communism and in the interest of keeping the United States economically sound and militarily strong, I sincerely hope that enough Members of this House will stand up and vote their honest convictions and defeat this bill.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I intend to take only a few minutes, and will confine my remarks largely to expressions of confidence and respect for the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. JAMES P. RICHARDS, who is fighting to get the best program possible out of this debate.

The distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. RICHARDS] has always fought hard for an enlightened foreign policy in the best interest of our country. At the same time he has been one of those who has kept constantly in mind the necessity of keeping foreign-aid expenditures within safe bounds in relation to the economy and well-being of our country.

All of us know that being chairman of a great committee in the House of Representatives is no easy job. Especially is that true of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It takes a strong man to stand up against tremendous pressure, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is doing today, and hammer out a sensible, effective, long-range program in the interest of preventing world war III and helping our boys on the fighting fronts in Korea when more tangible, more appealing but less valuable benefits are being promised on every side if the House would only vote to cut out the foreign-aid program altogether. I am in agreement with Chairman RICHARDS that the value of our efforts must be measured in terms of saving the lives of our American boys and preserving our great country so that we can continue to enjoy the American way of life. He has drawn fire, as well as members of the committee and those supporting this program, from Congressmen who say that this legislation provides too much money, and from others who say that it provides too little money, which to me lends credence to the belief that possibly this program, as it is being presented by the Committee on Foreign Affairs today, is not too far off base.

From my daily contacts with him I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman RICHARDS, realizes emphatically that the United States of

America and our taxpayers cannot continue to carry indefinitely the tremendous burden that we have had to shoulder in the past few years. But he realizes also that we cannot live alone as a nation and be successful; and he knows, too, that we cannot solve our problems by running away from them. He has never run away from anything and I know that he is going to be successful in working out a reasonable program with the Members of this House. His dedicated effort deserves our backing.

I would like to point out that so far as the last request for foreign aid is concerned, Chairman RICHARDS personally introduced a new bill cutting off nearly a billion dollars before he even brought that legislation up for consideration before the Foreign Affairs Committee and then the committee made further cuts in it. Under his leadership something was done that a lot of people who challenge the Foreign Affairs Committee said was an impossibility, and that is to cut off the program once it was started. The American people and the recipients of our economic aid had been promised that the ECA program would end last year and he led the fight to end that program. Direct threats of invasion from Russia necessitated the development of a realistic program of military assistance to our allies as an alternative to letting Europe and Asia go by default to Russia which surely would have multiplied our difficulties and our expenses a hundred times. In such a situation we probably would already be fighting world war III with losses beyond our imagination. The establishment of an independent administrator of this program who incidentally has done a very good job, shows the statesmanlike and independent character of the chairman and the members of the committee who insisted on this policy.

During floor consideration of the original Mutual Defense Assistance Act, H. R. 5895, on August 18, 1949, the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman RICHARDS, proposed an amendment to cut the original authorization for the North Atlantic Pact countries in half, from \$1,160,990,000 to \$580,495,000, and to limit the authorization to 1 year instead of 2, as proposed by the committee bill. The Richards amendment was adopted in the House by a vote of 209 to 151. While the reduction was not retained in the latest conference agreement, the limitation of 1-year was kept—with forward contract authorization—so that the Congress insisted on the right to review the program a year later rather than 2 years afterward.

In explaining the purpose of his amendment, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] said:

The committee amendment proposes a 2-year program and provides the funds for it. It is proposed that about one-half of it be spent the first year, the fiscal year 1950. I propose that this Congress authorize no more than one-half of it now, and when they come back here next year and report to the Congress as to what progress has been made in the field of unification, standardiza-

tion, and cooperation in Europe, we will consider their case on the basis of achievement. Everyone understands that those three elements are essential in any defense plan against communism if it is going to be a success.

So, ladies and gentlemen, the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman RICHARDS, is realistic about this thing. He deplores waste and inefficiency. He wants the other nations to do their part too. I sincerely believe he is fighting the most effective way for the most precious values of all—the protection of his boys and perhaps your boys in the service and the security of our country so we can continue to live, to worship and act like proud, worthy Americans.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. The gentleman I know has been very much interested in the entire foreign-aid program and has likewise been interested in protecting our own domestic industry and productivity. It came to my attention when I was in Europe in 1949 that from behind the iron curtain in Poland considerable imports of Polish ham were coming to this country. My area represents a very important production area for the meat of this country, particularly pork. I came back home and have since had the opportunity to check into it and I find that we are bringing into this country considerable quantities of Polish ham. I believe in 1950 we brought in about 7,000,000 pounds and about 5,000,000 in 1951. I wonder if the gentleman, who has had an opportunity to study this problem at considerable length, can explain for the benefit of the committee why we who are trying to protect the free people of Western Europe are permitting these extensive imports to come in here in direct competition with our own products and at the same time permit the dollars to escape behind the iron curtain where they most certainly will be used against us.

Mr. BATTLE. I appreciate the contribution that the gentleman has made and also the very pertinent question he has asked. As the gentleman knows, I have been very vitally interested in the proposition of controlling trade behind the iron curtain, especially the curtailment of shipments that would add to the war machine of the Communists. If the gentleman will study the latest figures he will see that all trade to and from the iron curtain has reduced considerably in the past few years. I think and hope that trade coming in this direction at the present time is proving to be beneficial to us rather than to the nations over there.

Mr. HARVEY. I know it has been the policy of our own country, insofar as dealing with our allies in Western Europe is concerned, to discourage further trade with the satellites, with countries behind the iron curtain, and with the Soviet Union insofar as it is possible to do so. It was not only the general effect the bringing of Polish hams here would

have upon our industry but it was likewise difficult for me to understand how we could explain our attitude to our allies over there when we were doing the very thing that we suggested they not do.

Mr. BATTLE. Actually, we are insisting that our allies follow our embargo and screening policy with Russia and her satellites at the cost of losing our economic, military, and financial aid because they were trading with the enemy to the detriment of our mutual security long after we had stopped trade of vital materials.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute. If he will yield to me, I would like to say that the gentleman who is speaking now is the author of the Battle Act which establishes the policies just outlined. He has made an extensive study of the question of East-West trade. His bill was passed by the Congress and I am sure that the results will be everything that the gentleman desires in connection with this competition that is coming to us from behind the iron curtain.

Mr. HARVEY. I would like to say that the farmers of Indiana, who have seen a cut of 50 percent in the price of their products, do not take very kindly to seeing billions of pounds of Polish ham coming into this country in competition with our own.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman knows we are still importing dried eggs from Hong Kong, China, which come out of Communist China. They are not produced in Hong Kong.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman will send me a Polish ham I shall appreciate it.

Mr. GROSS. I will take the gentleman out here on Rhode Island Avenue and he can get an armful of them this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, this Mutual Security Act amendments now before us authorize an expenditure, more than heretofore authorized of over \$6,000,000,000. Those of us who oppose this bill will have very little time to make our objections known. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, is enthusiastically for the bill and on the minority side, the gentleman from Ohio evidences a similar attitude. These two men grant the time to Members who desire to speak. I desire to speak, hence I go to the Republican side and ask permission of the ranking Member, the gentleman from Ohio. He knows I am against the bill and hence I could not expect much time nor did I get it.

The first question asked by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, to soften up the opposition, was this:

Do you think the United States is in danger? Are we in danger of losing the land we love and its institutions which we cherish?

I did not answer his question then, as I could not have done so without using his time. I answer now, Yes, sir; we are in danger of losing our form of government and the institutions which we cherish, but not from the source you suggest—Russia. We are more in danger from those who advocate the building of a world government through the United Nations, than we are from the Russians. This NATO—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—is a branch or offshoot of the United Nations, and the chairman who asked that question has always been doing his utmost to support the United Nations. Now he wants us to appropriate more than six billions to support this illegitimate child of the United Nations. If the gentleman would be a little more hesitant in advocating the United Nations, he might observe that the enemy this Nation has to contend with is the very organization that he, in his great wisdom, recommends to the people of this country.

Does he not know that when the Senate approved the Charter of the United Nations that it took away from Congress the power to declare war? Does he not know that as long as we remain in that organization, the Security Council of the United Nations has the power over war that the Congress had under the Constitution? Does he not know that in case we are attacked, we can use our own judgment in the manner we choose to defend, but after the first clash, the future conduct on our part is not determined by ourselves, but by the Security Council of the U. N.?

Does he not know that the love of country and reverence for our institutions, which he is so afraid we shall lose, is being lost this very day through the instrumentality of the U. N., which he supports?

Does he not know that the UNESCO is the publicity agent for the U. N. and the NATO and that a calculated and premeditated course of instruction has been planned and that the children of this country are to be the first to be indoctrinated in this new education to educate the people to become citizens in this world government?

Does he not know that Columbia University is now busy with two phases of this education: First, the selection of the proper textbooks for our schools; and second, the preparation of teachers to go out and teach this new doctrine? Does he not know that this teaching is going on today in our public schools? Does he not know that these teachers say that the love of country and its institutions is a handicap for this new citizenship? Does he not know that these teachers say the love of country taught in the homes of children must be eradicated? The gentleman, I am

sure, is a loyal American and wants to preserve our Government and our institutions, but the irony of it is that the very institutions which he wants to protect are being destroyed by the very organization he supports.

I will further say to the gentleman that there is not a law on the statute books of South Carolina relating to FEPC—a live subject south of the Mason and Dixon's line—that cannot be repealed without any action on the part of the Legislature of South Carolina, or the Congress of the United States. If there is any law in the South on this subject that conflicts with the Charter of the United Nations it will be automatically repealed. Two courts in California have already decided that the provisions of the Charter, as approved by the Senate of the United States, becomes the supreme law of this country. If these court cases are followed, all that would be necessary to accomplish the repeal of all segregation laws in the South would be to bring an action in court. When the gentleman supports this organization he is contributing to the overthrow of State laws on matters of human welfare. In the approval of this Charter every Senator from the South who was present voted for the Charter.

This is a dark day for the forces who wish to preserve the Constitution of the United States and our institutions of society. In this report filed with this bill there is not a single Republican signature dissenting from the majority, and in the vote which follows I will venture the opinion that 80 percent of the Democrats will support it and 50 percent of the Republicans. In other words, this Congress wants to continue our foreign program that is costing us \$1,000,000,000 every month; that is fast placing a tax burden on the people of the United States which they cannot bear; that is costing us the lives of our boys—with no end of it in sight. Already 112,000 American boys have been lost in this senseless policy. But this Congress wants to keep it up. The chairman on the Democratic side, the chairman on the Republican side say we must have this foreign policy.

If everyone in Congress wants this foreign policy continued, why have a political campaign at all. Why put Truman out? Kefauver is for the same thing; Eisenhower is for the same thing; Stassen is for the same thing; Dewey is for the same thing. If this Congress is so hell bent on keeping up this foreign policy, why not leave Truman where he is? He can ruin the country just as fast as anybody else who can follow the program.

Well, some say Truman has had a lot of crooks in his administration. That is correct, but I do not believe the President knew what they were doing. If you leave the Republicans in power for 24 years, it is barely possible that a few crooks would turn up, so if you Republicans in this House want to keep and support the Truman foreign policy, why do you not be honest about it and support the man who has been running it?

There is only one feature of this appropriation which I will support, and that is aid to refugees. The United States has been an asylum for the oppressed and discouraged of all countries, and we have kept this asylum here for 150 years. The people who came and found freedom where it did not exist in their homeland have become Americans and have built this great Nation of ours. These refugees who have been downtrodden, helpless, and hopeless should be allowed to come here where our Constitution gives them an equal opportunity with all others to enjoy a government of freedom. We can give this aid in the name of humanity. We should always maintain on these shores this great Nation where people from every nation may come to escape the tyranny under which they have struggled in the land of their birth. We shall lose this great Nation if we do not preserve our Constitution and expend ourselves into a condition where communism will spring right up in our midst.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the yielding of time by the gentleman from Ohio to one who is not a member of the committee. Under the circumstances the time yielded is reasonably generous, although on a subject of this kind it is manifestly impossible to even attempt to cover as broad a problem and as broad a situation as the one with which we are dealing and which I firmly believe to be the most important legislation which will come before the Congress at this session. All of our policies, domestic and otherwise, our taxes, our national debt, our present crisis in Asia, everything stems, in my judgment, from the foreign policy which we have unfortunately adopted.

There is only time to discuss one or two phases of this matter. I think we ought to be a little more skeptical, a little more careful about how we read our headlines and how we listen to our radio commentators from time to time. It was made to appear, for example, when Mr. Acheson returned from the Conference in Lisbon—and his speech emphasized over and over again—that he had made giant strides at the International Conference in Lisbon. Those were the words we heard for some time after he returned: "Giant strides made by these four men conferring in Lisbon." I think we ought to look for a moment to see what some of those giant strides were. One of the things he emphasized most particularly was that by the end of 1952—and after all, that is still some months from now—that we would have 50 divisions in the NATO army in Europe. You read that story just a little bit more carefully, as I think was mentioned by other speakers and by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] a moment ago, and you will find those 50 divisions are not really 50 divisions; they are actually about 25 combat ready divisions, as was apparent in that same

statement if it were read carefully enough, and was also made clear by the testimony of Lieutenant General Gruenther before the committee in the other body some weeks after the Acheson speech. These 25 combat ready divisions—and I think even that is optimistic—is not very much of a giant stride in a build-up of defense against the only possible aggressor, which is the army of Soviet Russia, which has in being, I understand, not less than 175 divisions, so that the giant strides do not seem to me to be worth quite so much emphasis as was then given them.

The gentleman from Iowa also mentioned—and this is something which is lost sight of, and I think it has been somewhat disputed of late, too—that when Mr. Acheson returned he said that they had made another stride; they had agreed upon the amount of money necessary to finance this program over the next short period—I think some 2 or 3 years; I think it was 3 years, and that amount was decided to be \$300,000,000. Well, of course, we have had enough experience to realize that if there is any necessity to raise the sum of \$300,000,000, that means that the money will be raised by the United States. I emphasize the point made by the gentleman, whom I listened to very attentively, that when these four men got through deciding, they had, of necessity, to go back to their parliaments. Nothing was decided; they just had agreed among themselves to go back to their parliaments and say, "This is what we talked about at Lisbon, and now what can we do to implement it?" And when Mr. Schuman went back to the French Parliament he said, in effect, "Now look, boys, we talked about \$300,000,000 for the further defense of the NATO army. You have to pay your share. Your share is not too much of this right away, but you will have to raise some millions;" I think it was \$157,000,000, and as soon as he mentioned the word "money" the French Cabinet fell.

The point I am seeking to make is this. I have tried since I have been in Congress time and time again to advocate and support a program to build up a common and truly mutual arrangement, but this thing is not mutual and it has not been. We have been looking to our allies to assist us and act with us in good faith. But, they just have not been doing it.

I would like to call your attention to this, which is rather significant. The President said in one of his recent speeches that the French are making contributions to this cause, and while they are not helping us much in Korea—we are paying 95 percent of the cost in Korea as every Member of this House knows, both with respect to casualties and money—while the French are not helping us in Korea, they are joining with us in the common fight against communism, and they are doing their work in Indochina.

Let me suggest for the consideration of the House that in Indochina, although the opponents of the French there are in

all likelihood led by Communists, I am not sure that is a war against communism in Indochina. I am very much inclined to think it is a fight by the French to maintain, to keep hold of, their colonial empire in that territory.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think it should be pointed out, however, that France is exerting herself in this general effort around the world to resist communistic aggression. We often, in our observations over some failure of France to conform to our foreign policy, overlook the monumental sacrifice that this little country is making. Her population is much less than ours and it is true that her casualties in Indochina are proportionately in excess of ours in Korea.

Mr. HAND. I get the gentleman's point. I think that is a perfectly fair observation to make. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the cream and the flower of the French Army—and they are suffering casualties—are in Indochina, and they are spending there approximately the amount of money the United States is giving them under Marshall plan funds for this collective effort of ours.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman agrees that the expenditures of France in Indochina in an operation that is vital to our defense are in excess of Marshall plan aid, which France has received?

Mr. HAND. I think it is roughly the same. It may be somewhat in excess.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think the gentleman will find that it has been in excess.

Mr. HAND. While I have a great admiration, as I think we all have, for the past history and traditions of the French people, in this fight against communism we must always bear in mind that the French parliament, is now approximately 30 percent Communist itself, so that perhaps our dependence upon them is not altogether reliable.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Does not the gentleman agree that that indicates that the severity of the struggle in France is accentuated by that? Here is a converging by the Communists on France that puts a greater burden on those who are resisting and who still, we can be thankful, constitute the majority. In other words, the democratic ideal is still prevailing in France.

Mr. HAND. There is no question but that the French people are bearing a burden, but there is this question: There have been lots of remarks made lately that we have to help France because their economy is still violently suffering from the effects of the war. I call to the gentleman's attention a recent article, written, I think, by Mr. Karl Hartman, of the Associated Press, who may or may not be an expert on this situation, who tells us that the French production of steel and coal and the other munitions of war is very much higher now, very much higher than it has ever been, including the period before the war, and

that out of the population of France today, which is some forty-three or forty-four million, there are only 33,000 persons in that country unemployed; so that their economy as a matter of fact is quite stable and quite prosperous. I think they could do pretty much their full share.

It occurs to me that this business of supplying all arms for Europe is rather an anomalous situation, because for years and decades and centuries Europe has been quite able to supply its own armies to carry on a continuous series of wars. It seems to me a rather new thing that now they are unable to make arms and unable to use them except those with which we supply them.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman could point out any provision of this bill which will help the political situation to which the gentleman from Arkansas referred.

Mr. HAND. I am sure I know of none. I mean I do not suppose that we could, under any circumstances, and probably would not even desire to interfere, as we say, with their internal affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. And the fact remains that the French Government at the end of the last war could have given at least some independence to the Indochinese, and perhaps avoided what was going on. They invited it.

Mr. HAND. I think that we are carrying water on both shoulders. On the one hand we say that we are against the colonial system, and that we believe in the self-determination of peoples. On the other hand, we support the French in their fight for their colonial empire in Indochina, and we support the British in their fight for their colonial empire in Malaya.

If we examine the President's statement urging this bill with realistic eyes, and with minds actually seeking the truth, we find that in effect it is a series of completely unproved assertions and is a piece of special pleading for the large appropriation which he wants. Now I hasten to say that I think that Mr. Truman is sincere about the program. There is not much else he can do. He has been advocating this aid and assistance to Europe for the last 6 years, and he cannot very well say now that he thinks the whole thing has been a mistake and we had better stop it. He has got no place to go except go on.

In the very beginning of the President's speech, which you probably heard on the radio, or saw on television, he said this:

The Mutual Security Program is just what its name says. It is the way to get security, security against aggression and war, through mutual effort, through the effort of many nations helping one another. This program is already in effect and is working successfully.

How I wish that that were so. While for many years I have had the gravest doubts about our ability to make a practical working success out of the Government's foreign policy, I have repeatedly said that I believe in and favor the United States participating on an equitable and fair basis with other civilized nations of the world working toward the goal of mutual security and world peace. If such a program were really working effectively, you and I would have great cause to rejoice. But the simple truth is that it is not.

Let us look again at the President's statement that "we are obtaining security through the effort of many nations helping one another." Let us see what nations are really helping to achieve security for themselves and for the United States. In the beginning, we can pretty much dismiss Greece and Turkey from any European defense effort in Western Europe, because they are behind the iron curtain and it is not likely that they can be useful at all unless we are insane enough to contemplate some land action in Asia. The individual soldiers of both armies are courageous fighting men, but both are located badly for any effort in Western Europe; both are financed to a very large degree by American money, and it is a very grave question as to whether they are assets or liabilities. We can certainly dismiss Luxembourg, which is not as large as my congressional district; and we can pretty well dismiss Norway and the Netherlands, because, although they have some of the best people in the world, they have not either the population or the resources to put up a fight, and were beaten to their knees in a matter of days during World War II by strong air attacks.

I have not forgiven and I am sure you have not, the monstrous conduct of the Germans in World War I and II, and I fear the complete revival of the economic and military power of Germany will create as dangerous or perhaps more dangerous a menace than Russia now poses. Notwithstanding this, historically, the German Army has been the most effective fighting force in Europe in modern times, and it is very doubtful whether any defense of Europe can be successful without a full and enthusiastic German participation. There is not a German soldier today in any European army. I do not see any signs whatever of the willingness of the German people to once again militarize themselves, and to once again subject themselves to the hazard of a major war being fought across their territory. And it is certainly safe to say that for a year, or 2 or 3 years, you will not see an effective German Army in the field with the unified European army. If there is a menace, it is now, and not 3 or 4 years from now, and within that time you will not see German participation. Of equal importance is the limited cooperation by France. Now the great bulk of the best of the French Army is, and has for some time, been engaged in fighting a colonial war in Indochina, to

such an extent that they are wholly unable fully to participate in the so-called joint defense of Europe, as they have been completely unable to assist us in our major war in Korea. Not only is that true, but as I just said, the amount of aid under Marshall plan funds and for military aid and other purposes that we have been giving France so generously over a period of years has been all spent—all spent mind you on their colonial war in Indochina. The President admits this in his speech and he says that after all that is their contribution because they, too, are fighting communism. But I am again suggesting to you that although their enemy may be led by Communists, they are really fighting for the preservation of their colonial empire.

France has been taxing our materials and our efforts to build bases in France and for France, and when they were asked to raise their taxes by some 15 percent to participate in the defense of France and of Europe, that the government fell because their parliament refused to raise taxes for that purpose; and the truth is that Europe for the most part, and France in particular, and Belgium notably, are far better off than they were before the war. If they insist on fighting a long-drawn-out, completely fruitless war in Asia, that is their fault and not ours.

The most important point that the President made and the only one in my judgment which is worth much consideration is the fact that he said that if we do not have friends somewhere, there are vital materials which we need that we cannot get. Well, that is not too true, because you can always buy what you need. Indeed France and Germany were buying from each other right during World War I. But he does make a terrific blunder when he talks about our needing steel from somewhere else, when the fact is that we are the great steel producer in the world, and when he talks about possible shortage of copper and aluminum, he overlooks the fact that we do not get those materials from Europe, we get them from the Western Hemisphere. Few materials that we need are not obtainable in enormous quantities either in our own country, or in the other countries of North and South America. If you think we rely on Britain or Malaya, or any other place for rubber, I call to your attention our magnificent efforts in the production of synthetic rubber at the beginning of World War II, and it is a great shame that that production was ever allowed to die out, because we can produce more synthetic rubber than we need without relying on Asian production of natural rubber to any substantial degree.

The President quite naturally backs up his Secretary of State and repeats Mr. Acheson's speech that the agreement made at Lisbon to establish a European army represents one of the greatest advances toward European unity that was ever made. The truth is that there was no international agreement made there at all. There was an

agreement between four men which has to be subject to the scrutiny and in some cases the opposition of the parliaments of 14 different nations. When they agree, then it is time to talk about great strides and great progress toward European unity. Mr. Truman makes a great point of what we have been doing in and for Indochina, and that we have been introducing irrigation and providing the pumps to pump water for irrigation and so increasing their supply. Increasing the food supply for whom? For Indochinese natives, who are fighting our ally, France, and unfortunately giving them a hard time, too. Along the same line he talks about the essential steps of boosting food output in India, and generally helping India. Well, the Congress last year passed an appropriation of \$190,000,000 to supply wheat for India, and I have not seen the slightest change of the attitude of the Indian nation toward us or toward the United Nations since that gift was made.

I still want to emphasize that a little bit more effort, and a little bit more money, and a little bit more attention to the home front will strengthen more our economy and our ability to defend ourselves, than scattering this money to the four corners of the earth.

The President said in the course of his speech, and I quote:

This is not a program to carry the world on our shoulders. It is a program to make it possible for the world to stand on its own feet.

If I could believe this, I think I might be for it. It is flatly untrue. It may not be designed for that purpose, but in effect it has been a program for us to carry the world on our shoulders, and I see no signs whatever of their standing on their own feet.

He says again:

The essence of this whole effort is that it is a joint effort. We do our part and others do theirs.

The criticism that I make is not the theory of this plan, but that in fact we do it all, and others do not do their share. Once more I am obliged to call your attention to the fact that in one place in the world where war has actually broken out, which, of course, is Korea, that 95 percent of the money, of the armaments, and of the blood and casualties of that war have been furnished, not by the United Nations, and not by France, or England, or Germany, or Luxembourg, but by the United States.

Mr. Churchill, with all the good will in the world, said to us when he was before Congress a few weeks ago that if a truce did not result in Korea that the action of the British Government would be resolute and immediate. He has been apologizing for that ever since he got back to England, because I do not think that the British people have any intention of participating in our effort in Korea, or to take any chances of further offending China by an effective alliance with us.

Any time that I am persuaded that we can rely on a really effective and mutual effort in which other nations do their full share and we do ours, I would be willing to look at such a program without prejudice. But so long as the United States is obliged to pick up the whole check, as we have been doing for the last 5 years, I must tell you frankly that I am "agin" it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to add in my discussion to the generalities that have been presented in this debate, around the general purposes of this particular bill. I am more interested in the direct problem of avoiding waste and misappropriation in any bill, and to be sure that in any bill which we pass in this Congress, we are going to get our dollar's worth. I appreciate that the bill before us is not an actual appropriation bill, but that it is an authorization. My experience, however, shows me that if you go ahead and authorize, then the argument that there is authorized is used when the actual appropriation comes up. That is the reason I want to discuss this matter of waste and misappropriation. Loose dollars will always beget waste and corruption. Frequently, when we get into a broad subject as in this bill, there is a lot of generalities and a lot of conflicting philosophies, and we lose sight of the fact that actually there may be some of us who are really concerned about one thing, and that is if we are going to do something, let us be sure that the dollars we say we are going to spend are going to be used for that purpose. Let us tie those dollars down so that there will not be any loose dollars. This bill, as I have gone through it, is full of loose dollars, just as I have noticed that every bill that the State Department has brought in is full of loose dollars. I mean by loose dollars, dollars that are just not justified. Possibly, they could be justified, but at least they have not been justified on the basis of the hearings and on the basis of facts and figures. That was the reason, incidentally, that I directed the attention of the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, this afternoon, and asked him whether or not the committee had studied the program in detail, which was set up in Lisbon because, after all, this bill is supposed to be for the purpose of enabling that program to go ahead. I was interested to know whether the committee went into the details, the end items that are supposed to be procured, and the scheduling of their production. There is nothing in the hearings other than generalities. I am very much afraid that it's all the committee has had to go on. Herein lies your danger of waste and misappropriation. Last year I debated against the foreign aid bill for the same reason, exactly. I said though the money had been asked for in certain amounts, \$8,-

000,000,000, I believe, there were certain funds still available and unspent. I am going to talk a little too about these unobligated items. With reference to the unspent funds, I said you could still go on without appropriating a single cent last year for Mutual Security and it would not affect the program at all. I submit the situation as we find it here on the floor today eminently justifies my statement because only \$1,000,000,000 of the appropriated sum was actually spent and here we are today ready to help do what is necessary to keep the program moving.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the gentleman's comment and his analysis of the meaning of that famous word "obligation." I assume he is going to come to that part of his remarks which should be studied by those who feel that obligations are something sacred and untouchable.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I certainly intend to direct my attention to it, because on page 32 in the committee's report it states:

Under United States fiscal procedure Government agencies are not allowed to enter into procurement contracts unless the funds have already been appropriated from which payment is to be made against such contracts.

The same statement was made in debate last year and I challenged it on the floor. To check my own judgment I called up the Government Accounting Office to find if that was true. It is not true. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is under the same misapprehension as the committee report. Actually, you can authorize, for example, the building of a battleship, and then you can appropriate what is to be spent for that particular year of construction of that battleship. Then, the next year you appropriate what is necessary then. You can do the same thing with this whole program. I submit it would be well if we would refer to the Constitution of the United States, which, even if the General Accounting Office did not limit us, limits us in that expenditure. The Constitution says, article I, section 8, the Congress shall have power "to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years." So you are limited there.

Now there has been a great deal of talk about this obligation of funds and long lead time items. I want to go a little further into this obligation of funds. It is a very complex problem, because if you base your question not on whether you are going to use the funds, but whether you are going to enter into a contract, it is very easy for the Government agency, whether it is the Army, the Navy, or the State Department, to get around the restrictions on appropriations. All you have to do is to enter into a contract, which contract can

actually have a late delivery date or a termination clause, and you can say the funds are obligated. The contract itself may be infirm and stupid. Later you may get out of the contract and then you can use the funds for other purposes, and that is exactly the wide open door to waste, corruption, or thwarting congressional will and intent. You must take a detailed look at the obligation contracts.

Let me refer exactly to what I am talking about. I called this matter to the attention of the chairman of the committee a little earlier today. On page 45, of the committee report, where we are talking about the amount of money that was appropriated last year for Latin America, the sum was \$38,000,000. This year the committee very wisely asked the State Department why that money was still unobligated—it was not even obligated, mind you, not spent and not obligated as of January 31, 1952. Mr. Edward G. Miller, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs said:

Before we can absolutely negotiate with the countries concerned we had to wait for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to draw up the plans under the appropriation for the best use of the appropriation.

I hope you get the significance of that. In other words, last year we voted \$38,000,000, and nobody knew what it was going to be used for. This Congress failed to go into the details of the matter nor did the committee go into the matter. Actually, if the matter had been gone into, the State Department would have admitted that they had no detailed plans for what they were going to use the \$38,000,000. What did the \$38,000,000 mean? Obviously it did not mean a thing. It was just a figure to hang some oratory on concerning our fine intentions to our South American friends. I am going to offer an amendment with reference to this item. Today the State Department is asking \$62,000,000 more, for South America, and that, too, has not been justified. There are no schedules, no figures, no breakdown. Just pious intentions and well phrased good wishes. Just exactly the sort of thing to slip loose dollars in on. Just exactly the thing that breeds waste and corruption. I think you will find the same thing is true of the \$3,800,000,000 that they are asking to implement the Lisbon conference.

I noticed some general remarks were made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] about the fact that this three and eight-tenths billion was for tanks and airplanes. He used some round figures in a most general sort of way. Now, I know a little something about the production schedule in this country. I will tell you right now that you cannot produce those planes or tanks for Europe in the next year, and you do not need that money because you cannot spend it. Our production schedule will not absorb it. All of this hue and cry that we are going to wreck this program by looking into it and trying to cut out these loose dollars which pro-

duce waste and extravagance, all of that talk is just so much malarkey. I noticed somebody pointed out what General Eisenhower had said on this program, that any sizable cut would endanger the program. But then when a reporter, not a Congressman, a reporter pinpointed him a bit, he said, "Surely, any budget can be cut in certain places." Then he added, "After all, I do not run a statistical department over there," or something to that effect. If people do not know the details, I wish they would quit generalizing and enable those who feel we should study the details to go into these details and find out when the money is being properly and realistically appropriated and when it is not.

This is not a question of whether we are for mutual aid or not. I happen to be for a mutual-security program somewhat along the lines of this bill and those preceding it, although that may surprise you a little bit; I am very strongly for the basic idea. But I certainly am not going to vote for something when I do not know where the money is going. And I am talking about details. These things should be looked into. It is Congress' duty to look into details and not just indulge in the happy luxury of generalizing and orating. We expect the committee to examine the details, but the committee has not done it. For that reason the committee may expect many more cuts to this bill, and I hope they will be approved by the membership.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In the first place, I may say to the gentleman there was complete discussion before the committee as to what end items were going to what specific countries. I think the gentleman will realize that certainly it would be a breach of security if we were to detail on the floor each and every item and to what country those items were going.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman first, Did you make any estimate or study about the delivery schedule of those end items? Did you look into the production schedules? And did the State Department have production schedules for those end items? I am willing to state that the gentleman found no production schedules, and that, indeed, there are no production schedules. That the program to implement the Lisbon Conference is not blueprinted, that the \$3,800,000,000 are figures out of the air—pious hopes and glittering generalities. Come back to the House when the program is sufficiently in shape to give us the details, otherwise we will be merely creating more loose dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will recall my statement he will remember that my statement was

that these figures were not projected against the program to produce the items in this particular current fiscal year, but we extended it over 3 or 4 years.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Exactly; and that is my point.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman should realize that you are actually in a position where contracts have been let for the tanks and the planes that we are talking about. The money we are authorizing in this bill is for additional tanks and for additional planes, none of which will be produced during this fiscal year, because it takes at least 2 years to produce a tank or a plane.

I may say to the gentleman that I have been just as critical as the gentleman and have been critical in the committee of what I considered the slow-down and lag of production schedules. I think the administration has gone too slow, but I believe they are finally on their way.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not want to yield further because I would like to answer that while I have time at my disposal.

That is the whole point; we do not need to appropriate the money in order to enter into those contracts; let us appropriate the money when the day of payment is within clear sight. We can authorize a schedule when you have your blueprint in detail, mind you, not in generalities; go ahead then and make your contracts and your firm schedule and total it up, then appropriate the money as and when it is necessary. This is the only way you stop creating these loose dollars from which spring waste and corruption. This is the only real way to get your dollar's worth.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman's statement is at complete variance with what has been given to the committee by the fiscal experts in charge of Government funds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. By the Government Accounting Office? By the Constitution?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, I will offer an amendment to the mutual security bill, the purpose of which is to deny foreign military or economic aid to any country that does not contribute the same proportion of its gross national product to the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength, as the American taxpayer is today being called upon to contribute to the defense of the United States and of the free world.

During the course of the Bonner committee's investigation overseas, American officials in country after country recited to the subcommittee the obstacles to economic recovery and defense production interposed by antiquated and inequitable tax systems—systems which weigh heavily on the underprivileged and allow the wealthy to escape making and substantial contributions to the national revenues.

The highly regressive indirect taxes prevalent in many European countries

have serious repercussions not only upon the distribution of benefits from various aid programs, but on the specific activities of our own forces in constructing and maintaining defense facilities. During our conferences in France, the subcommittee was advised that an estimated 15 or 16 percent of United States military dollars expended in France represented taxes paid to the French Government. These taxes were levied mainly on activities related to construction of bases and lines of communications across France. The Department of State is to be commended for its efforts to negotiate with the French Government looking to an agreement that would relieve the United States from paying such taxes in connection with its military expenditures in France.

The more enterprising of our ECA officials have worked diligently, if not always successfully, with the governments of recipient countries to bring about needed reforms in taxes, land tenures, and other fields, to provide a more solid ground work for Mutual Security. Greece and Italy have recently passed tax laws which promise some improvement and France has shown signs of active concern in the matter. However, our efforts must be even more strenuously exerted to promote and encourage measures of self-help to ease in some measure the burdens of the American taxpayer in supporting foreign aid.

The amount proposed to be spent for national security this year is almost four times what we spent for the same purposes in the year before the invasion of Korea. Our policy of containing communism around the entire Soviet periphery could well lead to the Kremlin's primary objective—the collapse of capitalism and free enterprise. It was Lenin who sometime ago predicted that the United States would spend itself into bankruptcy and destruction; and unless we take aggressive action to cut spending wherever possible, we are on the road to a realization of that prediction.

I am convinced, however, that a sound program of mutual security will do much to deter aggression and prevent world war III. It makes sense to put a rifle in the hands of a Turk, a helmet on an Italian youth, and furnish a French squad with a machine gun—provided they are evincing their willingness to fight and defend their countries by doing all within their ability to help themselves. If the program is to be truly mutual, then the cost should be borne mutually by those participating nations, consistent with their economic ability.

Some say that unless we continue to pour billions of our tax dollars into foreign lands, we cannot hope to provide an adequate defense of the free world. But is this true?

Through the Marshall-aid program, industrial production of participating countries far exceeds prewar levels. For example, using 100 as the index for 1938, industrial production in Western Germany in June of 1951 was 153; in Belgium, 144; in Denmark, 155; in Italy, 138; and in Turkey, 152. Shipbuilding and steel production in Western Europe

far exceeded prewar levels. The volume of foreign exports of Marshall-plan countries amounted to only \$722,000,000 in 1938, whereas in June of 1951, it totaled almost \$2,500,000,000.

With these facts in mind and realizing that many of these same countries supported large military forces solely through their own economy prior to World War II, it is difficult to understand why we must continue to pour unlimited American tax dollars into those same countries in order to insure that they are now prepared to defend themselves against communistic aggression.

We have been assured by our military leaders and those advocating continued and expanded military aid to other countries that these recipient nations have the will to resist communism and that they can be counted on when the chips are down to stand by our side. Unfortunately, our only experience to date in this respect has been in Korea.

Now, specifically, just what will my amendment provide? If adopted, the Director of the program will be required to determine for each fiscal year the gross national product of the United States and the proportion of that gross national product which the United States expends for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world. Gross national product is, of course, the total value of all the goods produced and the value of the services rendered in a country. It will include, for example, the value of all of the automobiles, ice boxes, and clothing produced during a given year, as well as the value of services rendered by professional people as measured by their income. This is the yardstick used, for example, by economists and by our own Mutual Security people in measuring the economic ability of a country.

After determining the gross national product of the United States, the Director will then be required to determine the gross national product of a recipient country and the total amount of its gross national product that is being contributed to its own defense. In the event a recipient nation is not carrying its share of the mutual burden, then the Director is to notify that country of his intent to terminate assistance authorized by the Congress.

Now, for the purpose of determining the amount being spent by any nation for the development and the maintenance of its own defensive strength, I have taken into consideration the fact that the American soldier is the best-paid soldier in the world today. In contrast with the pay and allowances received by the American serviceman, the Turkish soldier, for example, receives only about 20 cents a month. Since we choose to pay our soldiers in this way, it does not appear fair to me to include this item of expense in our determinations.

For the purposes of my amendment, I have also excluded our expenditures for military assistance to other nations and our expenditures for atomic energy purposes.

Therefore, these three items would be excluded from the Director's determination as to whether or not a recipient country was contributing the same proportion of its gross national product to its own defense, as was being contributed by the American taxpayer to our share of the mutual burden.

Within 60 days after the Director serves notice on a recipient country, mutual assistance is to be terminated unless the President determines that adequate measures have been or are being taken by the nation concerned to assure that the proportion of the gross national product expended for defense will not be less than the United States, or, that the contribution required by this amendment would seriously jeopardize the political or economic stability of the nation, and that adequate measures are being taken by the recipient nation to make the full contribution to the mutual defense effort that is permitted by the manpower, resources, facilities, and general economic conditions.

Should the President make such a determination and continue the mutual aid to that country, then that fact will be submitted in the report required by the Mutual Security Act.

This is not a new idea. In the case of the Philippines, the United States was compelled to make the extension of further economic aid contingent upon certain internal economic reforms subsequent to the findings and recommendations of the Bell mission. Agreements between ECA and the Philippine Government led to the enactment of a minimum wage law for the first time in the history of that country and reorganization of the tax system, to the extent that 60 percent more in taxes is now being collected by the Philippine Government.

If this remarkable increase in revenues by establishment of a more equitable tax system is any indication of the possibilities in Europe, budgetary deficits now compensated directly or indirectly by American economic aid can be to a large extent eliminated.

Although there are numerous statistics to the contrary, let us accept, for the purpose of this discussion, the figures furnished me by the Mutual Security Agency as to the percentage of gross national product being collected in taxes by the countries receiving our aid. The total in the 14 European countries is 22 percent, as compared with 18 percent in the United States. Those figures represent tax revenues by the Federal Government alone and do not include taxes being collected by subordinate units of the Government.

Now, how is that money being expended by these recipient countries? In the fiscal year 1951, the United States contributed approximately 50 percent of its total budget for defense; whereas, the United Kingdom contributed only 22 percent; Italy, 23 percent; France, 30 percent; and Belgium-Luxemburg, 15 percent. Today, more than three-fourths of our total expenditures will go for major national-security items.

I realize that it might be politically unpopular with the leaders of the other

nations to have to deny their people some of the governmental and social services that they demand; however, in America, we are turning a deaf ear to our own needy citizens and doing without many worth-while projects because of the tremendous sums being disgorged from our Treasury for defense and foreign aid. Most of the countries receiving our aid are blissfully unaware of the contributions being made by the United States to their own recovery.

An analysis of the tax structure of the countries receiving foreign aid leads me to the conclusion that our whole program is tending to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer. For example, foreign aid under the mutual assistance program can be extended to the owner of a shipyard in Trieste to build ships for use by Italy in connection with its defense program. The owners of that shipyard will realize considerable profit as a result of our aid. But little, if any, effort is being made to collect income taxes from those same people in order to help finance Italy's defense effort; and when Italy then faces a budgetary deficit, we send more American dollars to Italy in order to balance its budget and keep its economy strong.

At the same time, however, the worker in the Trieste shipyard is being taxed heavily through excise and sales taxes and he sees little, if any, tangible benefits from our foreign-aid program.

As one American official stationed in Trieste stated with respect to the tax situation:

You can't have a stable, strong society if all of your taxes are of the nature that we have here—highly regressive taxes. There are taxes on our grocery bill and taxes on our cigarettes and salt and sugar and bananas, rather than an income tax.

Additional billions can be raised in each of the countries that we are extending aid to if they will enact sensible revenue laws and collect taxes from those who have the ability to pay.

As an example of what I mean, in the United States we are today raising 71 percent of our total tax revenue from individual and corporate income tax. By way of comparison, in France only 29 percent of its total revenue is derived from such taxes; in Great Britain, 46 percent; in Turkey, 10 percent; and in Italy, 13 percent. Now, obviously, we cannot dictate to these sovereign nations and force them to overhaul their tax systems to our liking; but we can insist that those recipient nations make a comparable effort to that being made by the American taxpayer. That is exactly the purpose of my amendment.

The American taxpayer cannot long continue to carry the whole backbreaking load of defending the world. We are asked to raise more taxes, but we have already scraped the bottom of the tax barrel. If mutual security is to continue, the taxpayers of other countries must assume a proportionate share of the burden. Unless they are so willing, then there is little hope that our pump-priming program will be successful.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. As a fellow member of the Bonner subcommittee that made that trip, I want to compliment the gentleman on his observations and compliment him on this piece of legislation that he is offering as an amendment, which I think is absolutely sound, and something that will do a great deal to reinforce the morale of the American people which I think needs a little reinforcing at this time.

Mr. LANTAFF. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think it will certainly put a good taste in the mouths of our American taxpayers to realize that the other peoples of the world have at least put their shoulders to the wheel to the same extent that we in the Congress are requiring them to carry the load.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this 1952 Mutual Security Program because I feel it is necessary to the defense and the security of our own country, the United States of America. We on the Foreign Affairs Committee have already cut the administration's figure by \$998,900,000 for foreign aid. We, of course, must also have a military budget for our own defense domestically, which Congress has also cut to eliminate waste and inefficiency. The other necessary part of our defense program is the defense of our allies upon whom we will depend for support in case of trouble.

The Mutual Security Director came before the Foreign Affairs Committee and said that he felt that the American men were entitled to have other people share with them in the defense of freedom, and that our American young men are entitled to have well-equipped allies. That is what we are doing by the Mutual Security Program of 1952.

As a matter of fact, the defense policy of NATO and mutual defense has already been basically set. It is not at present in dispute. This bill is simply the third implementation of a policy of military assistance to our allies as part of mutual defense against aggression.

Congress ought to look to see what we are going to get out of the current defense program and what our dollars are going to buy. For example, at the present time we in this country have 3,465,000 men in the Armed Forces. Canada has 91,000. Our United States Air Force is now being expanded to 126 wings and 17 groups. These people in the North Atlantic Treaty area that are being helped by this bill have 1,880,000 men now under arms.

At the Lisbon Conference last February the NATO countries agreed to provide 50 divisions by the end of 1952, 25 of them to be available on D-day and 25 more available at intervals between D-day and D-day plus 30. These NATO countries will provide 4,000 operational aircraft. They will give 704 major combat vessels and 924 smaller combat vessels toward our mutual defense. In addition to that, as you remember, under the Greece and Turkey aid program,

these countries have forged ahead and have become real allies of ours, and they have now in being 25 good divisions. The sum total of this progress in mutual defense is a real threat to any aggressor who might try to disturb the peace of the world.

Our people in industry know that the farmers have a stake in this program. It has not been brought out to date in this debate, and I should like to speak something of that.

Europe is a group of countries that have pretty well exhausted the expansion of their agricultural production. They have gone about as far as they can, so that their expanded agricultural needs will have to be filled from abroad. One out of every three European citizens now depends on food from abroad in order to meet a modest prewar standard.

For example, Europe depends right now on 500,000,000 bushels of wheat from abroad, 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 bushels of feed grains, fifty to sixty million bushels of soybeans and peanuts, 1,000,000 tons of rice, 2,500,000 tons of sugar, six to seven million bales of cotton per year, and 600,000,000 pounds of tobacco.

In fact, in the postwar period, if we look to see what has happened in agri-

culture in this country we will find that our exports of wheat to Europe have increased 650 percent. Canada increased her export of wheat only 10 percent, Argentina decreased around 50 percent, Australia dropped from 106,000,000 bushels of wheat export a year in the 1946-48 period to 60,000,000 bushels. And, of course, Europe has lost the granary section of Eastern Europe behind the iron curtain.

The head of the Foreign Affairs Department of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Garnett, was before our committee, and said this:

One of our important points here is that the basic and natural relationship between the United States and Western Europe is one where Europe is dependent upon American agriculture, not upon American industry.

So that any people from farm areas in Congress who want to keep and maintain a good set of customers and have these customers solvent customers so that they can stand on their own feet and purchase their own food, should vote for this bill. We are helping these free countries defend themselves and lightening the governmental budget load when the burdens of rearmament for mutual security not only have resulted in increased aus-

terity but have threatened to bankrupt economies in several instances.

Our safety and security require us to defend America and together with our friendly nations, to increase our strength so that no attack on the free world can be easily accomplished. We work for peace and security through the mutual security program.

The people from United States industry, and I from the city of Pittsburgh, know that the defense of these areas from which we get our raw materials, is essential to the continued high rate of production which we have in our industrial cities. Our prosperity depends on our having access to the raw materials which we process. We, therefore, want to keep open those areas in a free world so that these raw materials can flow into the United States of America and be processed and sold to our own people, and sold abroad in order to have good trade and good commerce and good defense.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I know there will be arguments on the status of the funds available and obligations and expenditures under the Mutual Security Program, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point such a statement.

Fiscal status of Mutual Security funds

MUTUAL SECURITY—ESTIMATE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE, OBLIGATIONS, AND EXPENDITURES ¹

[Includes funds appropriated through fiscal year 1952 for ERP, China Aid, and MDAP on cumulative basis from inception of programs, and amount requested by the executive branch for fiscal year 1953. Also includes point 4 and other programs authorized in the Mutual Security Act for 1951 for fiscal year 1952 and amount requested for fiscal year 1953]

[In millions]

	Military assistance					Defense support, economic and technical assistance							Assistance to Spain ⁸	Total Mutual Security assistance	
	Title I	Title II	Title III	Title IV	Total ²	Title I ³	Title II ⁴	Title III			Title IV ⁷	Title V			Total
								Excluding UNKRA ⁵	UNKRA ⁶	Total					
OBLIGATION DATA															
1. Net cumulative funds available through fiscal year 1952	\$9,556.7	\$936.4	\$1,271.1	\$38.2	\$11,802.4	\$13,284.8	\$160.0	\$577.6	\$50.2	\$627.8	\$25.9		\$14,098.5	\$132.5	\$26,063.4
2. Cumulative obligations through Mar. 31, 1952	7,566.0	652.5	812.2		9,030.7	12,802.9	86.2	449.9	10.0	459.9	17.4		13,366.4	52.7	22,449.8
3. Unobligated balance Mar. 31, 1952	1,990.7	283.9	458.9	38.2	2,771.7	481.9	73.8	127.7	40.2	167.9	8.5		732.1	109.8	3,613.6
4. Estimated obligations Apr. 1, 1952, through June 30, 1952	1,782.5	229.5	380.5	22.4	2,414.9	481.9	73.8	127.7	40.2	167.9	8.5		732.1	59.8	3,206.8
5. Estimated total cumulative obligations June 30, 1952 (item 2+4)	9,348.5	882.0	1,192.7	22.4	11,445.6	13,284.8	160.0	577.6	50.2	627.8	25.9		14,098.5	112.5	25,656.6
6. Estimated unobligated balance June 30, 1952	208.2	54.4	78.4	15.8	356.8									50.0	406.8
7. Authorization request for 1953 (executive request)	4,145.0	606.4	611.2	62.4	5,425.0	1,810.2	196.0	408.0		408.0	22.0	\$29.8	2,475.0		7,900.0
8. Total available for obligation 1953	4,353.2	660.8	689.6	78.2	5,781.8	1,819.2	196.0	408.0		408.0	22.0	29.8	2,475.0	50.0	8,306.8
9. Estimated obligations 1953	4,353.2	660.8	689.6	78.2	5,781.8	1,819.2	196.0	408.0		408.0	22.0	29.8	2,475.0	50.0	8,306.8
EXPENDITURE DATA															
1. Net cumulative funds available through fiscal year 1952	9,556.7	936.4	1,271.1	38.2	11,802.4	13,284.8	160.0	577.6	50.2	627.8	25.9		14,098.5	162.5	26,063.4
2. Cumulative expenditures through Mar. 31, 1952	1,958.3	253.1	362.4		2,573.8	11,730.2	44.8	316.2	10.0	326.2	5.5		12,106.7	20.2	14,700.7
3. Unexpended balance, Mar. 31, 1952	7,598.4	683.3	908.7	38.2	9,228.6	1,554.6	115.2	261.4	40.2	301.6	20.4		1,991.8	142.3	11,362.7
4. Estimated expenditures, Apr. 1, 1952, through June 30, 1952	1,058.4	109.5	166.1	.3	1,334.3	726.4	94.0	153.2	40.2	193.4	17.2		1,031.0	52.3	2,417.6

¹ This schedule is prepared on a net appropriation basis with adjustments reflected for actual transfers of funds between appropriations. However, the 1952 figures have not been adjusted for comparability to conform with the minor changes proposed in the 1953 appropriation structure.

² Reflects the merger of funds appropriated for the Mutual Defense Assistance program with the funds appropriated for military assistance pursuant to the Mutual Security Act for 1951. Excludes \$478.2 million transferred to title I economic under authority of sec. 101 (b) of the Mutual Security Act for 1951.

³ Reflects the merger of funds appropriated for the ECA European program with funds appropriated for economic assistance under title I of the Mutual Security Act for 1951.

⁴ Includes only 1952 funds appropriated for the economic program under title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

⁵ Reflects the merger of funds appropriated for assistance to China under the China Aid Act of 1948 as amended with funds appropriated for economic assistance under title III of the Mutual Security Act for 1951. Excludes \$125 million appropriated for purposes of sec. 404 (b) of title IV, Public Law 472, 80th Cong., and excludes \$10 million transferred to State Department for China-Korea student program pursuant to Public Laws 327 and 535, 81st Cong., as amended.

⁶ Includes only the unobligated balance brought forward from funds appropriated for assistance to the Republic of Korea for 1951 pursuant to sec. 303 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

⁷ Includes funds appropriated in 1952 for the Mutual Security Act of 1951 plus a balance at end of fiscal year 1951 brought forward from funds available to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

⁸ Includes funds appropriated in 1952 for the Mutual Security Act of 1951 plus \$62.5 million public debt authorization for loan to Spain authorized in ch. XI "Foreign Aid," Public Law 759, 81st Cong.

Fiscal status of Mutual Security funds—Continued

MUTUAL SECURITY—ESTIMATE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE, OBLIGATIONS, AND EXPENDITURES—continued

[In millions]

	Military assistance					Defense support, economic and technical assistance							Assistance to Spain	Total Mutual Security assistance	
	Title I	Title II	Title III	Title IV	Total	Title I	Title II	Title III			Title IV	Title V			Total
								Excluding UNKRA	UNKRA	Total					
EXPENDITURE DATA—continued															
5. Estimated total cumulative expenditures, June 30, 1952 (items 2 and 4).....	\$3,016.7	\$362.6	\$528.5	\$ 3	\$3,908.1	\$12,456.6	\$138.8	\$469.4	\$50.2	\$519.6	\$22.7		\$13,137.7	\$72.5	\$17,118.3
6. Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1952.....	6,540.0	573.8	742.6	37.9	7,894.3	828.2	21.2	108.2		108.2	3.2		960.8	90.0	8,945.1
7. Authorization request for 1953 (executive request).....	4,145.0	606.4	611.2	62.4	5,425.0	1,819.2	196.0	408.0		408.0	22.0	\$29.8	2,475.0		7,900.0
8. Total available for expenditure, 1953.....	10,685.0	1,180.2	1,353.8	100.3	13,319.3	2,647.4	217.2	516.2		516.2	25.2	29.8	3,435.8	90.0	16,845.1
9. Estimated expenditures, 1953.....	6,391.7	531.5	896.1	43.0	7,862.3	1,888.9	140.0	346.0		346.0	20.0	28.5	2,423.4	60.0	10,345.7
10. Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1953.....	4,293.3	648.7	457.7	57.3	5,457.0	758.5	77.2	170.2		170.2	5.2	1.3	1,012.4	30.0	6,499.4

Source: Prepared by Comptroller, Office of the Director for Mutual Security, May 7, 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 7005 is designed to help meet the responsibilities of our country in its present position of free-world leadership. We supply this leadership through our foreign policy. H. R. 7005 is legislation now necessary to further implement that policy. Therefore, a brief evaluation of our foreign policy should be helpful at this time.

Our foreign policy is the average reaction to international affairs of all American citizens, who, as individuals, want, first, to have his or her own chance in life; second, to assure at least as good a chance in life for their children; third, to set their own pattern of life; fourth, to live in peace; fifth, to be a good neighbor. By and large, this concept is consistent with the basic objective of the foreign policy our Government is striving to implement. That objective is to preserve the security of the Nation while helping to create desirable world environment. There is no simple prescription for the making of a democratic foreign policy, and regardless of varied ideas and interests, it remains the same—America seeking a way and a means to transform its hopes for a peaceful world into realities.

The President of the United States has the authority for conducting foreign relations, with the Department of State acting as his right arm. Congress holds the purse strings. Both the President and the Congress are responsible to the people. The American people themselves speak their minds on United States foreign policy in a thousand ways. Through the press, radio, and television, and through the leaders of their churches, clubs, unions, and other organizations. The views expressed reach those who are responsible in making policy recommendations and are taken into account in arriving at policy decisions.

I think we ought to examine some of the basic concepts upon which America's foreign policy rests.

One major premise is that our freedom and our security are directly linked to the freedom and security of the entire free world. The programs under which we are cooperating with our foreign friends in building the collective defensive strength necessary to deter aggression is based on this assumption.

A second premise of our foreign policy is, that it seeks a just and honorable peace. Let me repeat that phrase, "a just and honorable peace." It is certain that we cannot have security for ourselves if we do not have a just and stable peace. It is equally certain that we cannot have security with a peace that was manufactured and dictated by the Kremlin. Peace without justice is not a secure peace.

A third premise of our foreign policy is that America's security is directly affected by the social and economic condition of the other free peoples. I am thinking here of the living standards of the people living in the underdeveloped areas. America will not have genuine security without a stable peace. We will not have a stable peace so long as hunger, illiteracy, and disease are rampant among millions of people who know that there is a better way to live and who are determined to seek that better way. The urgency of the world's need should remind us that promises do not feed the hungry, nor resolutions give them shelter, so we must be willing to act when we are shown what to do. Let us leave empty promises to the exclusive use of the Communists.

Communism feeds on economic discontent and social upheaval. Communism holds out a hope—false though it be—of a better world. And though the Communists' promises are one thing and their actions quite another, we dare not assume that they are not getting temporary results. For the hungry and the sick, the picture the Communists paint is much like the straw for which the drowning man grasps. We are in a position to offer the hope that can become reality.

A fourth premise of American foreign policy is that we must take positive action to promote both economic stability and military strength among our free neighbors. This is a part of the building of a free world strong enough to deter aggression, or, if necessary, to defeat it.

America cannot alone do all in today's world. We are big, but we are not that big. We are a wealthy Nation, but not that wealthy. We need friends. But we need solvent friends; and we must stay solvent ourselves.

If we Americans wish to preserve and strengthen our own freedom through our foreign policy, we must encourage and help the rest of the free world to do likewise. It is a tragic fact that hungry people are as much concerned with bread as they are with freedom. Communism pretends to offer bread. These offers do not develop into realities.

That is why our foreign policy is being implemented economically through the point 4 program. This program offers assistance to the people of underdeveloped areas. Point 4 marks America's awareness of how our own security is related to the standard of living of other peoples.

The underdeveloped areas of the world are being helped to develop their vast resources through the technical assistance and economic development programs carried on both by the United States, directly and through the United Nations. Point 4 is designed to help the peoples of underdeveloped areas to help themselves. It will raise their standards of living by helping them to develop a technological understanding of their own. Point 4 symbolizes the helping hand of Christian doctrine even as it is a positive force against the inroads of communism. It is one of our greatest investments in peace, and one of the least expensive.

Point 4 is at work in practically every field of economic development. American technicians are concerned with water, power, and mineral resources, transportation, public administration, housing, and social welfare. But the bulk of the work is concentrated in the

fields of agriculture, health, and education. With the aid of modern farming methods introduced by their American partners, the people of rural areas are making spectacular gains in food production. This program is at work in countries where governments are weak from the ravages of war and, for the most part, relatively young. It is believed that strong support by the United States in this juncture of their national lives will enable them to counter successfully further Communist pressures. The threat of communism in these countries is not primarily military. It is mainly in the human misery and unrest on which communism feeds. The chief defense against communism and tyranny lies, therefore, in a powerful and concerted attack on poverty, disease, and ignorance, and their attendant miseries.

If point 4 is successful in relieving the economic hardship in these countries, we will have saved many times over the cost of the program. It has been estimated that the entire mutual security program which includes point 4, for the fiscal year 1953, costs only a little more than 1 month of World War II. If we can build a deterrent to total war at less than the cost of 1 month of World War II, it is the best investment in security at the least cost not only in dollars but in lives, that we can make at this time.

The Marshall plan is an example of economic achievement. Though industrial output, intra-European trade, and exports increased considerably under the plan, it would have been hasty to pronounce Europe recovered; however, the vicious circle of which Secretary Marshall spoke had been broken. The structural underpinnings of the European economy had been restored.

The mutual security program is designed to assist economically and it is based on solid foundations such as the Marshall plan. It helps to bring the benefits of an expanding world economy to both the United States and our allies, and to provide the underlying strength required for the common defense. Its aim is to include both military and economic aid and is designed to create the strength necessary to prevent aggression. Economically, it helps to bring the benefits of an expanding world economy to both the United States and our allies, and to provide the underlying strength required for the common defense.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was established to implement our foreign policy militarily when in 1949 the nations of the North Atlantic area joined together in a treaty of mutual defense. Backed by this assurance and by American military assistance, the Western European countries began the costly process of rebuilding their military strength.

Today, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has armed forces in being on the Continent of Europe with plans for continued build-up. General Eisenhower expressed the conviction that well-armed, highly mobile forces will be able to meet attack if it should come.

Under the NATO plan, the United States is providing certain Army, Navy,

and Air Force units, military equipment for our allies, training programs, and defense support in the form of raw materials and other commodities. Our contribution is directly related to the contributions of the other North Atlantic Treaty countries. Their contribution takes the form of military manpower and equipment, military supplies, defense construction, and mutual agreements to place forces under unified command.

We have sought to build positions of strength militarily, under the Mutual Security Program. This program also helps to prepare the free world's defenses along the frontiers where aggression most seriously threatens.

Mutual Security is not a one-way street. It costs a small fraction of our expenditures for our own military forces. Yet it gives us strong allies with military manpower far in excess of our own and with an industrial plant vital to the free world. It gives us overseas military bases for use in the common effort. It gives us sources of raw materials essential not only to our own military production but to the normal functioning of our civilian economy. It gives us friends throughout the world who are becoming devoted to a free and abundant pattern of life similar to our own and who will then be with us and not against us in the defense of these common ideals in the years ahead.

Here at home, the Defense Establishment is a major support of our foreign policy. Through selective service and the Reserves, when Korea was attacked, the United Nations was able to prevent a quick Communist conquest of the country because the United States had defense forces in the vicinity. We were able, in the face of appalling difficulties, to strike a retaliatory blow and, although greatly outnumbered, to resist the aggressor while we mobilized further.

Another important factor in implementing our foreign policy is the United States international information program. Its operating tools include press and publications services, radio—that is, the Voice of America—motion pictures, overseas information centers, and the interchange of persons. It deals with ideas. It does not deal with bullets, though there is a very specific relationship between ideas and bullets. It is my belief that ideas can be more powerful than guns. The successful operation of this program can mean the difference between global peace or global war. It is my belief that our security rests in large part upon our ability to promote an honest understanding of America and America's aims as well as to counter the lies and the half-truths which the Communists are spreading.

I am convinced that failure to carry on a vigorous offensive in the field of ideas would be to invite calamity. We are in a war of ideas and we had better stay in it, if we want what we need, namely, allies who understand us and have faith in us. The iron-curtain countries have geared their propaganda to the "big lie." Now, it takes a lot of money to keep up

a world-wide "big-lie" campaign. The Soviet Union and its satellites are now spending more than \$1,400,000,000 each year on this.

We have geared our program to the "big truth." That costs much less than the "big lie." During the current fiscal year 1952, there was an appropriation of \$85,000,000 for the "big truth" campaign. Our campaign of truth is the road to victory in the battle of ideas.

Much is being done in the written word. Press materials go daily to an estimated 10,000 foreign newspapers with a readership of more than 100,000,000.

As for magazines, pamphlets, and other publications, there is a minimum audience of nearly 500,000,000 people and the publications are printed in about 60 different languages.

Motion pictures, in 40 different languages, have proved effective in telling America's story of freedom and abundance abroad. Last year, 500,000,000 people in 86 countries saw these films.

Another important phase of America's campaign of truth is the exchange of persons program. In the past year, nearly 8,000 persons came to this country from abroad or went overseas on United States Government sponsored grants. Right now, there are more than 30,000 foreign students studying on about 1,400 American campuses. Less than 10 percent of these students are supported by United States Government funds. Strong emphasis has been placed on exchange of leaders in all fields—people who are opinion-molders and can exert influence in their home countries. These are people who have learned the truth about America firsthand and can spread the truth among their own peoples when they return.

Perhaps the best evidence of the effectiveness of these programs is the reaction of the Communists themselves to what we are doing. Take the Voice of America. We know that the Soviet Union alone is spending over a billion dollars a year on its propaganda activities. Much of that is being spent to keep our information materials and the Voice of America from penetrating the iron curtain. They are spending almost as much on jamming our radio broadcasts to Russia as we are spending on our entire world-wide radio program. The total Soviet expenditure on propaganda activities is more than 10 times as great as the amount we are spending on our international information activities.

The Communists have gone to great lengths to keep the Voice of America from penetrating the iron curtain, but they have not succeeded. We are getting through the iron curtain. In some of the satellite areas our listening audience is as much as 80 percent of those who have radio receivers. In some areas in the Soviet Union, 75 percent of our broadcasts get through the jamming screen. In Moscow and Leningrad, where the jamming is particularly intense—our average is about 25 percent. We are broadcasting around the clock to the iron-curtain countries in their own

languages. If we don't get through one time, we do another.

We can never win a peace with armaments alone. Ideas and attitudes are equally important. The battle for men's minds cannot be neglected. In the long run, success in this battle may well prevent one of bullets and bombs on the global scale.

The aid we are giving Europe is not charity. It is an investment in free-world stability and in our own security. We are not committed to support foreign economies indefinitely and we should not be. We are committed to helping these economies to become self-supporting.

But we should not make the mistake of thinking of economic and military aid as distinct and separate. They are anything but that, and we should never shut our eyes to the fact that military strength in a free country is a luxury of an abundant economy.

We Americans are traditionally a hopeful people. That spirit is standing us in good stead today. We do not see ourselves in the grip of circumstances over which we have no control and about which we can do nothing. We believe that a great deal can be done to better the world, and that we, in cooperation with the other free people, can do it.

Our foreign policies reflect that conviction.

We believe that the objectives we have set ourselves are possible of attainment. We believe that with hard work and persistence we can accomplish the tasks before us. We can, through friendly cooperation with other peoples, lead the way in building a world in which freedom and abundance can live.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the title of this act is "the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and other basic legislation with explanatory notes."

I suppose an explanatory note that could be added is an old Chinese proverb which says: "The more you sweat in peace, the less you bleed in war."

I think three challenges faced the United States after World War II: One, to sweeten our civilian economy, to keep it going; the second, to swab the sores left in countries by Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, to restore to those countries their national honor, based on peace, security, and prosperity: "Allies in war—allies in peace; enemies in war—future allies in peace." I think that was our motto.

The third challenge was to confront an ally turned enemy, which today seeks to give us a bear hug, to break our back and those of our friends wherever the concept of free government applies. I think we have met these three challenges forthrightly and boldly, with daring, vision, and success.

I am happy to be a Member of this Congress. It set a precedent, a precedent in the history of organized man. In the passage of the Mutual Security Act, the Eighty-second Congress took from the ashes of two concepts, some-

thing which I think is forging peace, security, and prosperity today and in the days ahead.

Bismarck said, "Empire extends to the end of your bayonet. Encase the nation in armor plate and you will be secure." That is what Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo did, and that concept turned to ashes.

Woodrow Wilson said, "Open covenants openly arrived at." So did the founders of the Peloponnesian, the Delian, and the Aelian Leagues, as well as the founders of the League of Nations. That, too, turned to ashes.

I think what we have done in this Congress, with the passage of the Mutual Security Act, is to blend those two concepts.

We are closing the gap between our bayonet and our covenant, bringing our bayonet within the shadow of our covenant, never allowing the bayonet to go ahead of the covenant, of what we stand for in organized society; this makes right might, and not might right, as did Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, and as Stalin is doing today. I think we have done a great job, and I intend to support this bill.

I rise not as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—which I am not—which has jurisdiction of this legislation, but because, having traveled last year in Europe, and having just returned from an extensive tour of the Orient, I think it my duty to report to the Congress some pertinent certain information, and to ask some questions, such as:

First. Why is it that Indochina for the first time needs to import rice? Perhaps the answer is that it lacks a sense of security, economically, to go ahead and to improve its production abilities.

Second. Why do the Philippines have to import rice? Again, is it because of the lack of a sense of security? Is it because of the inability of the people who work the land to own it; to be able to produce, as people do today, on Formosa?

I intend to point out that Chiang Kai-shek, in my opinion, today faces the greatest challenge of his political career in trying to make not Hong Kong in that part of the Orient, the showcase of democracy, but Formosa. Hong Kong, as I saw it, was a select, tradesman's world, where merchandise was sold. Formosa is democracy's chance in action. Democracy's challenge to southeast Asia and to millions of people in Red China lashed to Red tyranny. Properly led, the performance of democracy in Formosa can truly give hope for better days, and hope for success, in beating back and defeating tyranny in that part of the world, to those enslaved.

Chiang, yours is the chance to make Formosa a true gem in the blue Pacific. Chiang Kai-shek and your legislative Yuan, which I had an opportunity to address, if ever you had a chance to inspire southeast Asia and China, and the free world, for that matter, you have it today.

Another question: Why is it that Egypt, a Nation of 20,000,000, cannot

raise an army of 2,000,000 men? Who stops her?

Let us hear a little more about what is happening in economic, social, and political fields, so that we in Congress can feel that the thing we are trying to strengthen, in doing a job, is life, the world around, on a worth-while level. I think we are, and, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, why not let us create a greater magnet for freedom in the Pacific? We face to the east, as well as to Europe. The Hawaiian Islands are in the center of the Pacific. More nations circle them than anywhere on the globe. Would it not be fitting to establish a United Nations headquarters in the Pacific, on the Hawaiian Islands? I intend to introduce a joint resolution to this effect.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the proposed Mutual Security Act extension, H. R. 7005, calls for the authorization of \$6,901,000,000 for foreign aid in addition to \$1,000,000,000 of United States military transfers. This new authorization, added to the unexpended balances of funds already appropriated will bring the total available for foreign aid to more than \$18,000,000,000.

This situation recalls vividly the estimates made at the time of the original Marshall plan proposal when the estimates that I recall for all foreign aid ranged from \$20,000,000,000 downward. Most of the estimates were much lower than that figure. Postwar foreign aid has cost us \$32,700,000,000 to date and this bill is for \$6,900,000,000 more with no end in sight. We were led to believe that the Greek-Turkish loans, post UNRRA aid, interim aid, and the Marshall plan were the complete picture notwithstanding the fact that the flat announcement was made in the debate on the Greek-Turkish loans that military assistance was included therein for the avowed purpose of fencing Russia in and the Harriman Commission report on the Marshall plan submitted to Congress in November 1947 listed the strategic factor along with the political, economic, and humanitarian factors as the justification for the Marshall plan. Furthermore, the debate on the Interim Aid bill in December 1947 brought out the views of many members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the Marshall plan could be justified only on the strategic factor. General Marshall himself subscribed to that view.

I had voted in early April 1947 for aid to devastated countries which was based, as I thought, entirely on humanitarian grounds but became alarmed when military assistance was included in the Greek-Turkish loans and from that time forward, even though the Marshall plan was couched in terms of economic assistance, I viewed the entire program as a fuze leading to commitments for foreign military aid beyond our control and under conditions calling for a maximum expenditure for armament within our own land as a part of the world's

greatest armament race known to history.

In my speeches of December 5 and December 10, 1947, I severely criticized General Marshall for his commitment of American economic reserves to the battle front of the cold war without having any control of the time and place of the final decision. I hope it is of interest to turn back to my speeches in the debate here in Congress on December 5 and December 10, 1947, so I include them here:

DECEMBER 5, 1947

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am not one of the Members who toured the far lands during the past year. I traveled 340,000 miles in the 8 years I served on the Committee on Military Affairs, but I devoted last summer and last fall to the First District of Iowa, 12 counties in southeastern Iowa. What I say here will be my version of their viewpoint, with no effort to cover the entire State of Iowa, just the First District.

There has been a distinction made here in the course of the discussion between strategic moves and war. I have been involved in both. I usually associate strategic moves with war, either in war or as a prelude to war. My people so associated them. I will go along in the statement that there is a distinction between strategic moves and war, but the distinction is dangerously slight.

At the outset let me say this: If there is any doubt about my position when I get through with my remarks on this bill, I am against the bill in its present form.

The bill (H. R. 4604) before us today has for its purpose the extension of aid to European countries with special emphasis on France and Italy. During the closing weeks of the congressional recess last October and November, I had occasion to discuss the proposed European-aid program with many hundreds of my constituents in the First Iowa District. I carried on my discussions with my constituents on this issue throughout the entire congressional recess starting the last of July, but the interest in this issue increased considerably with the developments that led to the calling of the special session. I had an unusual opportunity to cover my district thoroughly for a period of more than 3 months, and I have asked for this time to bring you before you my observations of the thinking of the people of my district on this issue.

In the first place, the people of the First Iowa District favor very strongly our extension of any assistance we can give to Europe if it is given on a humanitarian basis. Their magnificent response to the Friendship Train movement is ample evidence of their support of humanitarian aid. On the other hand, they are just as vigorously opposed to any move that threatens international conflict, and they are seriously fearful of any strategic factors involved in a program of aid.

For the above reasons, I have been especially attentive to the discussion of this legislation in Congress and by the members of the President's Cabinet. When the President's committee on foreign aid made their report on European recovery and American aid—the Harriman committee report—I was disturbed by the following statement on page 2:

"The interest of the United States in Europe, however, cannot be measured simply in economic terms. It is also strategic and political. We all know that we are faced in the world today with two conflicting ideologies. One is a system in which individual rights and liberties are maintained. The opposing system is one where iron discipline by the state ruthlessly stamps out individual liberties and obliterates all opposition."

And again in point 2 in the summary on page 12 of the Harriman report, as follows:

"2. The United States has a vital interest—humanitarian, economic, strategic, and political—in helping the participating countries to achieve economic recovery."

Then, early in the debate on the rule yesterday, the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] in his reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Allen] was that he does not think this bill could be justified just on a humanitarian basis and, further, that it is justified solely on concern for the national defense of the United States.

During the course of the debate, I listened with great interest to the discussions and observations offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. August H. Andresen] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith]. I am particularly interested in the amendments these gentlemen propose to offer because in my opinion such amendments will go far to take out of the proposed legislation the strategic or war factor. The adoption of such amendments would go far to make this legislation acceptable to the people of my district and to me. Somehow I cannot sink to the level of holding our food supply before the hungry victims of postwar chaos in Europe and even hope to use those hungry victims as pawns in a prewar game of power politics and make of them human buffers between us and Russia. In my opinion, this is the worst possible type of imperialism and war planning. I have always contended that war is degrading and that the greatest threat to a victor nation is the possibility of becoming obsessed with the notion that it has been sent to this earth to rule the world. Many other great nations have marched down that road to their downfall and their doom.

In my opinion, the strategic factor in the present legislation qualifies this legislation as our second step into world war III. Our first step was the Greek-Turkish loan. I voted in favor of the aid to devastated countries in Europe last spring and then, later, I voted against the Greek-Turkish loan, because that bill definitely set up the Greeks and the Turks as pawns on our chessboard of world power politics. The Greek-Turkish loan was primarily intended for military assistance and was a brazen step to war. We cannot be so naive as to think we can maneuver against Russia in this way without incurring Russia's hatred for generations to come. Furthermore, our military experts, of whom General Marshall is certainly one, should know that such steps to war cannot be taken effectively without full preparation and placement to meet successfully the logistic requirements for war whenever the proper incident transpires. If the present legislation is openly a move against Russia, then let us admit we are engaged in a world armament race and a cold war simultaneously. The question then is, What is the most efficient and effective preparation for our defense?

I witnessed at close range the analogous steps into World War II: The repeal of neutrality, lifting of the arms embargo, shipping arms and ammunition to England after Dunkerque, and lend-lease. I called all of those steps, steps to war, and I opposed them. The arguments of the proponents still ring loudly in my ears. They were, first, steps to avoid war, then steps short of war, then "We will be the arsenal of democracy," then "Your sons will not be sent overseas to fight." We now know that they were steps to war and the Greek-Turkish loan and the bill now before us have the same implication. When will war come? Just whenever Stalin or his successor thinks we have slid back to unpreparedness and impotency sufficiently to enable them to strike startlingly, swiftly, and successfully.

I have always admired General Marshall for his mastery of military logistics. He demonstrated that ability as one of the distinguished young future generals on the western front in World War I. He demonstrated this ability again most effectively in World War II. If the Marshall plan and this interim-aid bill are based on strategic factors, however, I cannot give General Marshall credit for being a master of logistics in the cold war now in progress. Our moves for preparedness should be more efficient and more direct and more quiet. As this cold war develops, I suggest more emphasis upon adequate national defense and then I hope we can stop making faces at Russia in name calling, and return to the sound doctrine of Theodore Roosevelt, "Speak softly but carry a big stick." In my opinion, that policy will cost us infinitely less and it will win for us the respect of those nations that recognize and respect only power.

Furthermore, we must recognize the necessity of learning to live in a world with other nations having different ideologies. If we cannot learn to live in such a world without meddling with the political and strategic factors in other nations, we have already lost the peace our young men and women fought so gallantly to win.

I opposed going into World War I until Congress declared war. I then went to war the first day men were accepted for the first training camp, and I served 5 years. I opposed going into World War II until Pearl Harbor. I shall oppose taking direct or indirect steps into world war III, but I will join the effort of the Committee on Armed Services as vigorously as I can to build a strong America in this troubled and war-torn world before it is too late.

If the bill (H. R. 4604) is based upon strategic factors and is enacted into law without the Smith or the Andresen amendments, I want to build up our defenses so efficiently and so strongly that Stalin and his successors will not dare to strike us.

DECEMBER 10, 1947

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, during this discussion a great deal has been said on the floor about the generosity of Iowa, and we are proud of that generosity. The program IOWA, "Iowa's Own World Aid" program, and the CARE program and the contribution to the Friendship Train make us proud of Iowa's contribution on a voluntary basis; but let me assure you of one thing, the contribution Iowa has made has been strictly on the humanitarian basis. If this bill were on that basis you would find my attitude toward the bill somewhat different than it is. When the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee come out here and say frankly what their object is, namely, a strategic approach, I appreciate their frankness, but I cannot refrain from holding this measure is a tragic blunder on the basis of a military approach. I have had a commission in the Regular Army for more than 30 years, although I have had only 5 years active military service as an infantry officer and as assistant professor of military science and tactics, and only 8 years experience on the Military Affairs Committee. I do not claim high qualification as a military strategist but I think I do know enough about military strategy to rate this bill as about the worst approach to military strategy that I can imagine. That is my humble judgment. I have the greatest respect for General Marshall as a tactician and as a master of logistics and on the military front he has no peer; but on the economic front if the Marshall plan is a measure of his approach I should like to ask him bluntly what military general or economic general would commit so much of his reserves to the firing line as is contem-

plated in the Marshall plan unless he visualizes a quick decision and a final decision. In the troubled world of today and in this cold war of prospective long duration we should not commit so much of our economic reserve strength to this cold war battlefield. If this course is followed it will sap our strength to the point of seriously endangering our national security at one of the most critical times in our history. That is why I made my speech last Friday in the general debate that was rather critical of General Marshall and the Marshall plan. My criticism of the Marshall plan and of this bill is based on the sheer logistics of the situation since they have been presented to us as national defense measures. On the other hand I sincerely hope we can get some relief for the unfortunate people of Europe on a humanitarian basis, but until you put this bill and the Marshall plan on that basis I am going to have to oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that a grand total of \$73,687,000,000 net has been appropriated for foreign aid of all kinds since 1940. Of this total sum \$32,716,000,000 net has been appropriated since the end of World War II. Eight billion, nine hundred and forty-five million dollars of this fund will be unexpended and unobligated as of June 30 this year. Unless otherwise determined by Congress this sum will be held available for future spending over and above any further appropriations made for foreign aid.

The unexpended and unobligated balance, together with the new funds authorized by H. R. 7005 here under consideration, will make a grand total of more than \$18,000,000,000 available for foreign aid beginning June 30, 1952.

After 20 years of extravagant and wasteful spending by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations and after several years of war and police action combined with such tremendous sums of money appropriated for foreign aid, it is especially urgent that we survey our own fiscal structure before we add \$6,900,000,000 more for foreign aid by the enactment of H. R. 7005 now under consideration.

Brief analysis of our Federal spending budget, our debt, and our Federal tax record should be borne in mind while we have this gigantic foreign aid bill before us.

DEBT, SPENDING, AND TAXATION

Annual Federal spending today exceeds the total spending of any 10 successive years added together up to 1943. And Federal taxation for this fiscal year likewise exceeds the Federal revenue of any 10 successive years added together prior to 1943. The best available estimates are that the Federal spending record from the end of World War II to the end of this year will exceed \$400,000,000,000. We have, indeed, reached dizzy heights of spending and taxation far beyond the experience of any other nation, and our Federal debt at the end of next fiscal year will reach \$275,000,000,000 compared with the total debt of \$152,000,000,000 for all other countries of the world except Russia.

Under present Federal tax laws, if we assume the total personal income of all Americans for this calendar year will stand at \$255,000,000,000, their combined

personal income after business and personal deductions and exemptions, and after the payment of Federal taxes, would total \$70,700,000,000.

TOTAL INCOME OF CORPORATIONS

The total net income of all corporations in America in 1950 after payment of Federal, State, and local taxes was \$22,800,000,000 and in 1951 was \$17,900,000,000. For the first quarter of 1952, total net income of all corporations in America after payment of Federal, State, and local taxes was at the rate of \$16,600,000,000 per annum.

Those sums must provide for all living costs above exemptions, for all spending, and all savings and investments of all individuals and corporations in America. Yet Congress last year appropriated \$91,700,000,000 for Federal spending this fiscal year, and our new Federal budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, calls for \$85,400,000,000.

Total Federal tax exaction in the last 7 years has already exceeded the total Federal tax collections from the Revolutionary War to 1945.

The American people today are fully aware of the road along which Federal income taxation has taken us over the past 12 years. Under 1940 tax laws a family of four had to have a net income as high as \$14,200 before being required to pay a Federal income tax of \$1,000. Under 1952 laws, a \$1,000 income tax is levied on an income of \$6,850.

In 1940 the tax on a \$5,000 net income for a family of four was \$74.80. Under 1952 laws the tax is \$577.20. But with inflation our dollar today is worth only 53 cents as compared with the 1940 dollar, so the \$5,000 net income has shrunk to a little under \$2,350 of 1940 value because of taxes and inflation.

The foregoing discussion has dealt with corporate income taxes and with personal income taxes.

HIDDEN TAXES THAT HIT THE CONSUMER

Here is how a few of the hidden taxes hit the consumer:

	Real value	Taxes	Price
Soap.....	\$0.20	\$0.07	\$0.27
Bread.....	.09	.05	.14
Milk (quart).....	.14	.09	.23
Auto tire.....	19.20	8.80	28.00
Potatoes.....	.34	.15	.49
Cigarettes.....	.09	.15	.24
Hosiery.....	.97	.34	1.31
Telephone (month).....	6.60	2.95	9.55
Electricity.....	3.52	1.08	4.60
Eggs.....	.49	.16	.65
Coal (ton).....	9.00	15.00	24.00
Gasoline (gallon).....	.12	.14	.26
Shoes.....	6.00	3.00	9.00
Candy bars.....	.07	.03	.10

The Tax Foundation has estimated that a family of 3.2 persons having an income of \$70 a week and whose annual income tax is about \$300 averages \$798 in hidden taxes. They estimate also that a married man with 2 children must earn \$11,800 a year for his family to live as well as it did on \$5,000 a year in 1939.

TAX LOAD OF UNITED STATES AND ALL OTHER COUNTRIES

The estimate of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation

is that in 1949 the total tax load of the other 72 nations of the world, including Russia, was approximately \$68,000,000,000 and that the United States annual Federal tax revenue alone under present law will next year reach \$71,000,000,000.

Even so, a deficit of \$8,200,000,000 is estimated for 1952 and a deficit of \$14,400,000,000 is in prospect for 1953.

If all taxable personal incomes over \$4,000 were confiscated today, the total additional revenue would be only \$9,700,000,000. At present rate of Federal spending, this sum would last our Federal Government only 47 days. With the American dollar today worth only 53 percent of its 1939 value, the taxpayers are really having a most difficult time to meet the increased cost of living and pay their taxes.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

I will discuss one further point in which I have a tremendous interest because of its importance to our own defense.

Last year I made a review of the foreign-aid contributions to the United States strategic materials stockpile program and I included that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 8, pages 10243-10245.

By way of comparison let me call your attention to the fact that the stockpile acquired through foreign-aid programs last year stood at \$56,245,000; today it stands at \$102,937,000. Our stockpile objective is \$9,075,000,000. Our total expenditures on foreign aid to date stands, as I understand it, for economic aid, at \$14,800,000,000.

At the rate of foreign-aid spending to date and at the rate of acquisition of strategic and critical materials from this source up to date, it would require \$1,440,000,000,000 of economic aid to foreign countries to complete our stockpile program from this source.

At the rate of acquisition today it will require 311 years to acquire our strategic and critical stockpile entirely through exchange for foreign aid.

When I look back through the original debate on the Marshall plan and think of those grand promises of the great help that would come to us in the way of strategic materials through this program I cannot help but wonder how the sponsors of the Marshall Plan can justify those predictions and those boasts back in 1947 when they made the original effort to get the Marshall Plan and other foreign aid programs under way.

Furthermore some consideration should be given to the heavy consumption of our own supply of strategic and critical materials in the production of the military supplies we export in that portion of our foreign-aid program.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs must get away from the strategic and critical materials stockpile as a prime justification for this foreign-aid program.

(Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include speeches and

materials made and prepared by himself.)

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

DEFENSE BILLIONS DEFEND KAISER, NOT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, the amount of money to be appropriated by this Congress the coming fiscal year for our military establishments is perhaps the most widely discussed of any pending legislation. In my 10 years in this House, I have never seen it turn down any legitimate and honest request for money to make our country secure. In fact, in many instances we have voted more funds than the military establishments could use.

However, I wish to state here and now that I know and have learned a long time ago that our security is not dependent on how much money is appropriated, but rather on how wisely the money we appropriate is spent. As far as I am concerned with the manner in which our procurement officials in the military setup are squandering billions of dollars, we could easily double the military appropriations and still have no security.

I am especially concerned with our Air Force. The lack of Air Force equipment in Korea is tragic. In fact, it is so tragic that if we do not force some changes there soon, this Congress will not deserve the respect of the people we represent.

I visited with many officers of the Air Force in Germany. There, too, our air equipment is tragic. In fact, the officers themselves refer to it as the United States air farce, not the United States Air Force.

Yes, even here in our own country fliers are afraid to fly because of poor equipment, poor planes and poor maintenance and repairs. The mighty Air Force we once knew—today is ragged, poorly equipped and relegated to a status which many of its own officers call the United States air farce.

These tragic conditions caused me great concern. It compelled me to do some research. There is reason why, after hundreds of billions of dollars of expenditures, we still have no adequate air power. The reason is not in the personnel of the Air Force proper. Goodness, no. A finer lot could not possibly be found anywhere in the world.

Where, then, lies the trouble and the responsibility for these shameful Air Force conditions? Members of the House, it lies squarely upon the shoulders of the procurement officials responsible for Air Force equipment procurement. These men—and these men alone—are responsible for the tragic conditions of our air security and preparedness.

Let me give you a case of the manner in which procurement officials of the United States Defense Department squander billions and take care of their friends, rather than procure planes and plane equipment.

A year ago the procurement officials of the Defense Department awarded a contract to Kaiser-Frazer to produce

150 of the Chase airplanes known as the C-123. In spite of the fact that Kaiser-Frazer had the contract for a year not a single such plane has been produced. That is tragic indeed. But that is not all. In spite of this complete flop by Kaiser-Frazer in their first contract, not a single plane in a year, a few weeks ago the procurement officers of the United States Air Force sent a letter of intent to the Munitions Board which would award this same Kaiser-Frazer outfit a contract to produce 250 more C-123's.

For obvious reasons, the Munitions Board questioned this letter of intent. The Air Force procurement admitted that the letter was unusual—but said it was necessary in order to help Kaiser-Frazer "in its other negotiations."

Now Members of the House, when you and I appropriate billions for Air Force procurement, I thought it was to procure planes for our Air Force—not to help Kaiser-Frazer "in its other negotiations." Yet here we have the blatant admission by Air Force procurement officers that plane procurement is not first in their minds—their first interest is helping Kaiser-Frazer in its other negotiations.

Let us go back to the old Kaiser-Frazer contract, a year old for 150 planes, that is the 150 of the Chase airplanes known as the C-123. I said none has been produced during the year the contract was in effect. I must amplify this statement.

You read of that great auto promoter by the name of Tucker, did you not? You read of how he got parts of various automobiles, put them together, called it the Tucker—and swindled millions of dollars from the people of America.

Well, Kaiser-Frazer took a leaf from Tucker's experience. So that nobody could say Kaiser-Frazer has not produced a plane in a year on a 150-plane contract, they proceeded to out-Tucker Tucker. After all, Tucker had only to fool the people. All Kaiser-Frazer had to do was fool the United States Air Force procurement officials.

So here is what happened. About 2 months ago a great extravaganza was held at the Willow Run plant of the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. The press was invited. Air Force procurement officials were lavishly entertained. Rhetoric and champagne almost overflowed the banks of the Willow Run. A lush \$50,000 carpet was prominently displayed and rolled out to greet the suckers. The event was the dedication of the Kaiser-Frazer new gigantic C-119 flying boxcar cargo plane. And as the suckers viewed the unveiling and dedication, they looked with awe upon the great spectacle which stood before their eyes and bowed to Henry Kaiser, the great airplane builder, America's giant of industry.

But just a minute, gentlemen of the House, you have not heard all yet. Was this unveiling and dedication a cause for celebration or should it have been a signal to our Air Force procurement officers that a public mourning should take place for the taxpayer. Yes, gentlemen, public mourning with black crepe

and doleful music would have been more appropriate than the celebration participated in by Air Force procurement officers. Yes, Kaiser-Frazer out-Tucker Tucker.

Here is what the public and press were not told, and I doubt if the Air Force procurement officers knew. The boxcar plane C-119 so ceremoniously unveiled and dedicated and almost flooded in champagne and flowers, all at taxpayers' expense, was not built at Willow Run. Like the Tucker car—it was merely assembled there. But this was discreetly hidden from the press and the public. All of the parts for this plane were actually made at the Hagerstown, Md., plant of Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp. These airplanes are not only built but also assembled at Hagerstown. Yet here Kaiser-Frazer just bought the parts, shipped them nearly 1,000 miles, merely assembles them at Willow Run and states to the public, "Look at our great work. Look at the great plane produced by Kaiser-Frazer."

Has this sham paid off? Of course it has. So impressed were the Air Force procurement officers with Kaiser-Frazer genius that Henry Kaiser announced that Kaiser-Frazer will build 17 of these cargo planes during 1952. Yes, Kaiser said they will build 17 cargo planes at Willow Run. The fact is these planes will be built at Hagerstown and only assembled at Willow Run. But Kaiser fooled the Air Force once, so why could not he fool them 17 times?

And here is the tragedy of it all, and why, in spite of billions we have appropriated, our Air Force is still in shambles. The Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp. is an experienced and reliable producer of aircraft and the chief developer of this particular kind of cargo plane. Fairchild can turn out this plane, complete it at a cost to the Government of between \$350,000 and \$385,000. But to the Air Force procurement officers this is too simple and too cheap. Besides it may result in getting planes, and seemingly that is not what is wanted.

So what happens? Kaiser-Frazer is given a contract for 17 boxcar planes—parts built at Fairchild and shipped and assembled at Willow Run at a cost of between \$800,000 and \$1,500,000 per plane, or roughly twice or three times as much as they could be built at Hagerstown, Md. Is it any wonder that no matter how many hundreds of billions of dollars we appropriate for air power, it never seems to come about? And that is why we tax our people more and more and more—seemingly without end in sight.

Let us look at Mr. Kaiser's past record as a plane builder and planner. After viewing that record it is incredible that our Air Force procurement officials should award this man almost a quarter-billion dollars in plane contracts and letters of intent. Here is Kaiser's past record as a plane builder and plane planner.

First, the fabulous flying boat. When Kaiser first announced his plans

for building a gigantic aircraft, it was to be constructed of aluminum and he promised mass production in record time. He pictured a fleet of 5,000 of these 70-ton behemoths capable of carrying 500,000 soldiers across the Atlantic 1 day and returning 24 hours later with thousands of tons of food and supplies.

The War Production Board refused to consider the proposition since Kaiser had never built an aircraft in his life but finally agreed when he enlisted the aid of Howard Hughes, a recognized aeronautical expert. After several months had elapsed with no evidence of progress, the project was investigated by a group of Government experts who expressed grave doubt as to the feasibility of the plans. Funds to Kaiser were cut off after this investigation but were resumed by order of the President on condition that Kaiser or Hughes would personally supply the money to complete the project after the Government's \$18,000,000 was exhausted.

Shortly thereafter Kaiser removed himself from the picture and Hughes spent \$10,000,000 of his own money in a vain attempt to produce a successful airplane. When Kaiser had to put up a dollar of his own, he got out, as fast as he could. It should be noted that this dream of Kaiser's cost the taxpayers \$18,000,000 and Howard Hughes \$10,000,000. In this plane project Kaiser was a complete flop.

Second, was the Brewster Aeronautical Corp. Incorporated in New York, February 10, 1937, for the creation, design, development, construction and sale of various types of airplanes and aircraft parts. It acquired design rights, jigs, and fixtures on nine types of military trainers and observation planes from Consolidated Aircraft on April 10, 1939.

On April 20, 1942, at the direction of President Roosevelt, the Navy Department took possession of the company's four plants; two at Long Island City, N. Y.; one at Newark, N. J., and one at Johnsville, Pa., in order that they be effectively operated.

The President's order said that possession and operation by the Navy should be terminated as soon as it is determined that the plants will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the war effort. Henry J. Kaiser became chairman of the board in 1942 and took over active operation of one of the Long Island plants in November 1943 with glowing promises for stepped up production.

The company lost \$1,436,369 in 1942 and \$607,177 in 1943. Production went even lower under Kaiser's supervision and he quietly withdrew in April 1944. The total dollar value of the company's war work was \$73,000,000 and on April 5, 1946, the stockholders approved a plan to dissolve the company and liquidate its assets. Again as a plane builder for the second attempt Kaiser again proved a complete flop.

Third, was the Kaiser Fleetwings, Inc. This was organized November 17, 1942 as Kaiser Cargo, Inc., to manufacture

airplanes. They obtained \$1,000,000 loan from the RFC on March 4, 1943. The names were changed May 29, 1946 to Kaiser Fleetwings, Inc. Its announced purpose was to purchase Fleetwings, Inc., of Bristol, Pa., and to expand wartime facilities for the manufacture of airplanes.

This company likewise never produced any planes. So it contracted with Kaiser-Frazer Corp. to produce automobile doors and deck lids. The price on a cost plus basis was 75-100 percent higher than previous Kaiser-Frazer suppliers. So Kaiser's plant finally turned to the manufacture of bathroom and kitchen equipment and changed name to Kaiser Metal Products. The total capital investment is \$500,000. Henry Kaiser and Kaiser companies own 75 percent of stock and balance is held by friends of Kaiser.

Executive offices of the company have been held as follows:

President: November 17, 1942, to January 15, 1944, Henry J. Kaiser.

Vice President: November 17, 1942, to date, Edgar F. Kaiser. November 17, 1942, to date, Clay Bedford.

This third venture into the plane business by Kaiser like all others was a complete and dismal flop.

Here we have three highly publicized ventures by Kaiser in the building of planes. Each attempt was a colossal and dismal flop. Each attempt was as flagrant a failure as it was costly, costly of course mostly to the taxpayers of our Nation and the stockholders, but not to Kaiser. Yet our Air Force Procurement Officials entrust this same colossal failure with almost a quarter billion dollars of defense money to build planes. This is the same failure who has had a contract for 150 planes for more than a year and has not yet produced a single plane. No wonder our boys in Korea, Germany and elsewhere call it the United States air farce. I wonder if the Procurement officials of our Defense Department are more interested in defending Kaiser than they are in defending our Nation with air power?

Even if this time we did take Kaiser at his word, all he can do is assemble—not produce—just assemble 17 cargo planes the coming year. Why then, give him contracts and letters of intent for 400 planes? Especially why when these will cost three to four times more than they could be had from reputable and successful firms. As I indicated before, Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., which developed the C-119 Flying Boxcar in the first place is prepared to produce this plane and assemble it at a price of \$350,000 to \$385,000 per plane. The cost through Kaiser is from \$800,000 to \$1,500,000 per plane. Is there any excuse for such robbery of our defense efforts and money? And get this—in the time that it would take Kaiser just to assemble 17 such planes, Fairchild could manufacture and assemble 165 of the same planes for one-third to one-fourth the cost. Yet, the Air Force has ordered Fairchild to abandon all plans to produce planes in its Chicago plant.

Instead the Air Force officials went to the Willow Run unveiling to see Kaiser-Frazer out-tucker Tucker in a gigantic swindle and gave contracts and letters of intent to the smoothest and cleverest swindle of the ages.

How does Kaiser do it? How does he manage to bamboozle the public and suck defense dollars? Simply by placing his own key men in proper departments of the Government. There is an old saying around Kaiser headquarters. It goes like this—defense billions of dollars must defend Kaiser first, his friends in Government second and the Nation third. Here is how he swindles the Government out of millions of dollars a year.

After securing a \$25,000,000 loan from RFC on December 5, 1950, Kaiser went directly to a conference with Under Secretary McCone of the Air Force. McCone then gave Kaiser its first big Air Force order for building 150 Fairchild planes. Now who is this man McCone? First, he was associated with Kaiser in the shipbuilding business in World War II. Now get this, while McCone was Under Secretary of the Air Force he was merely on leave of absence from his position of president of Bechtel-McCone Corp. Now in turn the Bechtel family happens—just accidentally—to be holders of 4,200 shares of Kaiser-Frazer common stock. So McCone gets a convenient leave of absence from a Kaiser outfit, becomes Under Secretary of the Air Force and arranges a nice fat gift for Kaiser and that is how Kaiser manages to continue to suck defense dollars while our boys in Korea die for lack of planes and plane equipment.

But Kaiser never misses a bet. He takes no chances on having just one of his men planted where defense billions are handed out. He plays it safe always to see that he sucks every dollar he can at the expense of blood and lives. Here is another example of how he operates. Clay Bedford took a leave of absence from the position of vice president of Kaiser-Frazer. He became a special assistant to Director Charles E. Wilson of the Office of Defense Administration. Later Bedford became Deputy Administrator for Procurement and Production of the Defense Department. Still later Bedford becomes special assistant, believe it or not, to the Secretary of Defense. What a beautiful position to see that certain people get the easy money from the defense billions. Where is Bedford now? You guessed it. After being Secretary of Defense Lovett's expert on breaking production bottlenecks, Bedford suddenly and miraculously became president of Kaiser's Chase Aircraft Corp., the same Kaiser outfit that has not produced a single plane, yet got a contract for 150 and then a letter of intent for another 250 planes. Kaiser's stooges always stay in their Government defense jobs just long enough to take care of Kaiser and then they go right back to Kaiser to get their share of the blood money.

Our defense procurement officers and those close to it are replete with Kaiser

stooges. Warren W. Huff took a leave of absence from his position as purchasing agent of Kaiser-Frazer to follow Bedford to Washington and to become Assistant Deputy Administrator for Procurement and Production. Huff was head of the Steel Division of the War Production Board toward the end of World War II, and the manner in which he left that position to go directly to Kaiser-Frazer parallels the manner in which Walston S. Brown left the Maritime Commission to become secretary of Kaiser-Frazer at the same time. Walston S. Brown is the man who made arrangements for Kaiser to make millions on shipbuilding contracts as I will show a little later in this speech.

Why, just why is there such a Kaiser conspiracy to drain defense dollars into his lap? The answer is simple.

The financial statement of Kaiser-Frazer for the year ending December 31, 1951, shows a loss of \$12,300,000. This brings their 3-year operating loss to \$65,000,000. In his message to stockholders, the president pointed out that the loss was not as bad as it seemed because it gave the company an operating loss carry-over which it could use to avoid taxes during the next few years. There is a real policy question raised as to whether the Government should award lucrative war contracts to a company which is openly and boastfully in a position to avoid any taxes on profits from such contracts.

The company reports a net worth of \$10,000,000. The Wall Street Journal in an article dated May 1, 1952, states the net worth to be \$5,600,000. The difference apparently stems from a difference of opinion as to the value of certain assets. In either case, since the company has lost better than a million a month for over 3 years, it is clear that it will soon reach a state of insolvency if it has not already. The only possible hope is for additional Government financing. This raises a further policy question as to the propriety of entrusting vital Government contracts to a company which may soon be in the hands of the receivers.

Another example of the Kaiser method is brought to light in the opinion of Augustus Hand, of the second circuit in the case of Kaiser-Frazer against Otis & Co. That opinion holds that the Kaiser-Frazer prospectus with respect to its 1948 issue was definitely misleading and fraudulent. A prospectus of this sort is ordinarily given very careful scrutiny before being passed by the SEC. Can it be that Henry Kaiser also has friends in the Securities and Exchange Building?

The recent Kaiser-Frazer statement shows a V-loan of \$25,000,000 in addition to the various RFC loans, almost all of which are still outstanding. The statement does not reveal the existence or the extent of Air Force advances on its various contracts to Kaiser-Frazer but, in view of the limited working capital of Kaiser-Frazer, such advancing must be going on in order for the company to remain in operation.

Here is as true a picture of Kaiser-Frazer Corp. finances as is possible to get:

	Amount	Per share
Stockholders' equity Dec. 31, 1952 (per annual report).....	\$10,219,776	\$2.24
Deduct:		
Facilities not used in operations.....	3,457,158	-----
Intangibles.....	542,832	-----
Deferred charges.....	1,215,000	-----
Prepaid expense.....	837,818	-----
Other assets.....	1,316,269	-----
	7,369,077	.62
	2,850,699	-----

A further deduction of \$4,000,000 for 1952 estimates losses—\$1,000,000 a month at the rate of loss for past year—wipes out the stockholders' equity and leaves the corporation insolvent with a deficit of \$1,149,301.

So the picture now becomes clearer and clearer. Kaiser-Frazer Corp. is in financial trouble. At this year's end they will be defunct. So the billions we are appropriating for defense are used to bail out Kaiser-Frazer. Gentlemen, did we appropriate these billions for defense or did we appropriate these billions for personal manipulation so save a defunct corporation?

The procurement officers of the Defense Department should be made to answer the following questions:

(a) What is the total amount of money presently outstanding that the Air Force has advanced to Kaiser-Frazer?

(b) Of this total, how much has been advanced to Kaiser-Frazer with respect to each of the following projects?

First. The Fairchild plane C-119.

Second. The Chase Aircraft plane C-123.

Third. For general machine tooling and facilities.

Fourth. For west coast aircraft projects of Kaiser-Frazer.

Fifth. Any other advances made by the Air Force to Kaiser-Frazer, and for what.

Sixth. The terms and conditions with respect to which the foregoing advances have been made.

And finally these procurement officers should be asked to tell why defense dollars, blood money, that is, should be used to save a defunct corporation instead of purchasing planes and equipment.

This is a shocking situation and one that we cannot allow to go unchallenged in a period when we are asking the humblest laborer to give us over 20 percent of his net taxable income to support defense mobilization. I am told that the Armed Services Subcommittee studying military waste is currently considering the very contracts I describe, but, as great a waste as this contract may entail, I believe it is only a small part of a much more comprehensive fabric and I believe it is our duty to investigate every thread of this fabric in every phase of its intricate pattern. The following facts represent no more than a

collection of previously published information and yet, with nothing more, they tell an almost incredible story of how one man has lived and prospered solely at the expense of the American taxpayer. It explains Kaiser's method of using defense dollars to defend himself.

Until the outbreak of World War II, Henry Kaiser's only business experience was as a cement contractor building public dams and bridges in the western part of the country. Almost immediately with the beginning of hostilities, the Kaiser companies jumped into the shipbuilding business and within a short time Henry's methods of operation set the pattern which has typified his activities for the past decade.

Kaiser originally entered his shipbuilding contracts on a cost-plus basis but, as soon as operations had developed to a point where costs could be accurately appraised, he arranged with friends in United States Maritime Commission to change these contracts to a fixed-price basis. This ledgermain enabled Kaiser to realize tremendous profits as compared to the modest return cost-plus contracts would have yielded him. The feat was accomplished through the assistance and good offices of his Walston S. Brown, then a member of the Maritime Commission's committee on awards, now secretary and a director of Kaiser-Frazer Corp. But the pattern is always the same. The person in the Defense Procurement after awarding Kaiser contracts and favors never goes unrewarded. He always lands on Kaiser's payroll.

The United States Government paid for everything that went into the building of the shipyards used by the Kaiser companies. The United States Government paid for all material used in Kaiser ships, it paid for all labor and it paid for all administrative costs for individuals so employed up to \$25,000 per year per person. Henry Kaiser invested no capital and took no risks. He merely acted as manager of the Government facilities and for this service he was paid the rather handsome sum of \$192,287,284. How can this be rationalized on comparison with the hundreds of small and large contractors who had their profit on Government contracts reduced by renegotiation to a figure in the neighborhood of 10 percent on gross sales?

Kaiser's next Government sponsored project, the steel industry, was a wonderful deal not only because it yielded him a tidy return on almost no investment but also because it provided a wonderful device for rendering his shipbuilding profits practically exempt from Federal taxes. The shipbuilding company paid \$100,000 for all of the capital stock of the Kaiser Steel Co. The United States Government loaned the steel company \$125,000,000 and also permitted it the privilege of accelerated depreciation on its facilities. Thus, during the early years, while the Kaiser Steel Co. was being organized on Government

funds and was not returning a profit on its own, the profits of the shipbuilding company were being written off for tax purposes by amortization of the steel facilities. While other taxpayers earning a comparable income were being taxed at 90 percent, Henry Kaiser merely converted his profits into lucrative steel producing facilities and thus retained nearly 100 percent. Kaiser always has friends in every Department of the Government who take care of him.

Kaiser's wartime venture into the production of magnesium is also worthy of comment although for a change it does not appear, at least on the surface, that he personally made much of a gain out of the project. Of course he and his fellow shareholders received handsome dividends but they did not end up with anything in the way of valuable Government assets which is usually the case.

Early in World War II, the War Production Board ordered the RFC to build a magnesium plant at Los Altos, south of San Francisco. Kaiser heard about this and rushed to Washington with the proposal that the RFC loan him the money and that Kaiser would build and operate the Los Altos plant. The proposal contemplated no private capital except for \$100,000 already invested in the Permanente Metals Corp. which Kaiser had organized. Mr. Jesse Jones himself says:

The whole set-up looked a little screwy to me, one that would be of doubtful outcome.

Nevertheless with the help of friends in the RFC, Kaiser put his plan across. He got a loan from the RFC which ultimately totaled \$28,000,000 and he operated the magnesium facilities until 1945 when he was forced to give up the project because of inability to meet prices in a competitive peacetime market. In this instance the RFC was repaid in full but it nevertheless cost the Government heavily since Kaiser's entire operation was wastefully inefficient. Los Altos never got its production costs below 30 cents per pound whereas the RFC-owned plant near Las Vegas, Nev., which was managed by Anaconda Copper, produced magnesium at 18 cents per pound. In addition, Metals Reserve Company, an RFC subsidiary, had to subsidize Mr. Kaiser to the tune of \$2,500,000 by buying his product at higher than market price.

Permanente died as far as magnesium was concerned in 1945, but it was revitalized in 1946 when Henry got his hands on some very valuable aluminum facilities. The facilities in question were built by the Government and operated by Alcoa during the war. Kaiser obtained these facilities on a risk-proof lease-purchase arrangement from the War Assets Administration, along with below-cost contracts for Federal power to operate the facilities from the Federal Bonneville Power Administration.

The rights were first given to Kaiser-Frazier but as soon as their potential value was realized, they were quietly transferred to Permanente Metals

wherein Kaiser personally had a much larger share. In the first 11 months of operating these facilities, Kaiser and associates reported a net profit before taxes of over \$8,000,000. The original investment in Permanente Metals, now Kaiser Aluminum & Chemicals Corp., has never been added to by Henry Kaiser or associates but at the market close on March 8, 1952, their stock was worth \$87,780,000 and they had received cash dividends in excess of \$11,000,000 since 1946. The United States gave him these assets for next to nothing. No matter what department of our Government had something to hand out Kaiser was always the first to be taken care of.

It is also quite apparent that Henry's fabled genius falls short when it comes to producing automobiles. Kaiser-Frazier Corp. took advantage of Graham-Paige facilities and a starving automobile market to accumulate an earned surplus of over \$9,000,000 by the end of 1948. From that point on, however, the initial advantage was lost and, while the automobile industry generally was experiencing the best years in its history, Kaiser-Frazier production and sales declined steadily and the corporation shows a loss in excess of \$60,000,000 over the 3-year period ending in 1951.

Ordinarily we would expect this to close the book on a story, too often repeated, of an individual who prospered in wartime but could not make the grade in the competitive struggle of our peacetime economy. Whatever else can be said of Henry Kaiser, however, he is resourceful and the minute things began to dry up he was back at the public well with his bottomless bucket.

We have already noted how the United States Government sponsored Henry Kaiser's entry into the shipbuilding business, the steel business, the magnesium business, and the aluminum business. Good old Uncle Sam also gave him a big boost into the automobile business by selling Kaiser-Frazier Corp. the huge Willow Run bomber plant. This plant cost the Government \$42,300,000 to build during World War II. It was appraised at \$67,000,000 in 1949 and at \$105,000,000 in December 1950. This plant was sold to Kaiser-Frazier in September 1945 for a paltry \$15,100,000, and even that amount was not paid in cash.

The United States Government, through the War Assets Administration, also gave Kaiser-Frazier a tremendous boost by selling it a Utah blast furnace for \$782,000, full price deferred, and by awarding it a lease-purchase arrangement on a Cleveland blast furnace, although others had offered considerably more for the rights.

Kaiser-Frazier could not compete, despite these subsidies, however, and in 1949 it turned to the RFC, which had served Kaiser interests so nobly in the past.

On September 23, 1949, Kaiser-Frazier Corp. filed a formal application with the RFC in Washington for a loan of \$30,000,000. On September 30, 1949, an RFC examiner got out his report which recommended a loan of about \$25,000,-

000. The Kaisers were faced with repayment demands on a \$16,000,000 bank loan and each member of the reviewing committee of the RFC had expressed doubt that the loan could be repaid. Nevertheless, on October 6, 1949, the RFC Board of Directors approved a 10-year loan to Kaiser-Frazier for \$34,400,000.

Naturally, it was a terrific problem to find sufficient collateral among the declining assets of Kaiser-Frazier to pledge against a loan of this magnitude and the manner in which this feat was accomplished is one of the greatest examples of a person raising himself by his own bootstraps that history has ever witnessed. The RFC agreed to accept a first mortgage on the Willow Run plant as a principal item of collateral for this loan. The Government had sold this plant to Kaiser-Frazier only a few years earlier for \$15,000,000 and \$13,590,000 of that amount was still owing. The War Assets Administration very generously agreed to subordinate its claim, however, and the equity of Kaiser-Frazier in the plant was magnified by a timely reappraisal. Thus Henry Kaiser had again accomplished the impossible. He purchased a plant for \$15,000,000, paid about 10 percent of the purchase price, and then borrowed \$34,000,000 by pledging this same heavily mortgaged plant as collateral.

By any standard of good business judgment, this loan was fantastically ill-advised and dishonest to the core—it smelled to the high heavens. Here again Kaiser out-Tukered Tucker in bamboozling the taxpayers.

Even beyond its basic unsoundness, however, the manner in which this loan was arranged cried out with evidence of highly irregular procedure and perhaps even more. The application was filed directly in Washington and did not go through the normal field channels required of requests by ordinary mortals. Approval was stamped on the application less than 2 weeks after it was filed and less than 1 week after the examiner's report was given the Board of Directors. The amount authorized was \$10,000,000 more than the examiner recommended and even \$4,400,000 more than requested in the written application. Here we should ask what happened to the smelly Kaiser RFC deals exposed by the Senate investigating committee?

The RFC has, of course, asserted that negotiations had been going on for several months and were not publicized at Kaiser's request. If that is so, the matter is even more serious, because it means that a Government agency has collaborated with a private citizen in suppressing vital public information until the time when it could be released as practically a fait accompli. Thus the deal could be wound up before the tide of adverse public opinion had a chance to swell. A subcommittee of the United States Senate asked on October 11, 1949, that the loan be held up so that the facts could be studied, but the RFC declined flatly to heed this request. Gentlemen, such rank patronage has no place in the

operations of a properly run governmental agency.

Most men would have been satisfied with \$34,000,000, but not Henry Kaiser. On October 10, 1949, Kaiser-Frazer Sales Corp. applied for a \$15,000,000 line of credit. The RFC examiner approved immediately but the reviewing committee recommended that the loan not be granted because it was really for the manufacturing corporation and that its ability to produce automobiles was highly questionable. An interesting conclusion to be drawn just a week after this manufacturing corporation had been granted a loan of \$34,000,000. In any event, this adverse recommendation was ignored and a loan of \$10,000,000 was authorized for Kaiser-Frazer Sales Corp. on October 21, 1949.

One fact which I feel was very significant from the standpoint of the financial soundness of Kaiser-Frazer and the public policy of supporting its continuance in the automobile field was the fact that a real question had arisen as to whether Kaiser-Frazer was being operated to make money as a corporation or only to line the pockets of Kaiser and the ex-Government officials who arranged the deals and the loans.

The shareholders apparently had become tired of sub rosa dealings by Kaiser and others, such as the transfer of the aluminum facilities which we previously discussed, and were suing for an accounting on behalf of the corporation. In the same vein, the Kaiser-Frazer dealers were complaining bitterly about their treatment at the hands of the favored few. This is significant not only because it indicates a crumbling enterprise but also because it appears that Kaiser-Frazer was serving merely as a funnel with the Government pouring money in at the top and Henry Kaiser and ex-Government officials standing below with their wheelbarrows. Despite their importance, these facts were apparently never even considered by the RFC since no mention is made of them in any report I have seen.

With the granting of the above two loans, the total indebtedness of Kaiser interests to the RFC reached a figure of approximately \$140,265,000. In November 1949, loans to Henry Kaiser and his brood amounted to 32.4 percent of the total amount of such RFC loans. A Government representing over 150,000,000 people has no business operating a finance company to support 1 out of that 150,000,000 citizens and I cannot believe that objective thinking motivated the RFC when it committed its funds in this ridiculously overbalanced fashion. It was merely a plot of Government officials saying, "Kaiser we will take care of you—but you must take care of us."

The next loan to Kaiser-Frazer was announced December 4, 1950, in the amount of \$25,000,000. By the time the application was filed in November 1950, the first two loans had been completely disbursed and Kaiser-Frazer had shown a loss of over \$39,000,000 in 1949 and a loss of better than \$10,000,000 at that

date in 1950. The initial RFC examiner recommended denial of the application because the company's future prospects seemed unfavorable and because it would circumvent regulation W. The agency review committee and the agency manager at Detroit concurred in this adverse recommendation. On November 28, 1950, Examiner Williams recommended approval but the six members of the Washington Review Committee unanimously overruled him on the grounds asserted by the original examiner. Despite all of this, the RFC Board announced the loan of \$25,000,000 at a press conference held December 4, 1950.

Gentlemen, I am too old to believe in magic and there is only one other explanation for Henry Kaiser's ability to get loans from the RFC Board when good judgment, common sense and the entire staff of the RFC below the Board are arrayed against him.

Now back to the plane contracts. The day after he got the third RFC loan, Henry Kaiser met with Under Secretary McCone of the Air Force to discuss the production of aircraft. Incidentally, Mr. McCone was a business associate of Stephen Bechtel in the Bechtel McCone Corp., and at the time Stephen Bechtel owned 4,000 shares of Kaiser-Frazer stock. Mr. McCone was definitely in Henry's corner and the RFC also went to bat for him on the theory that, with some plush defense contracts to work on, he would be able to repay the RFC and justify its loans to Kaiser-Frazer. Members of the RFC Board denied any interference with Kaiser's obtaining of defense contracts when they were questioned by the Senate subcommittee, but the report of one of their own examiners, in connection with a \$7,000,000 advance to Kaiser-Frazer in February 1951 gives the lie to this denial.

The examiner's report stated that Kaiser-Frazer had received nearly a quarter of a billion dollars' worth of airplane contracts at our request, and it concluded with the observation that Kaiser-Frazer would probably be able to work its way out of its financial difficulties through profitable war contracts, but that it still needed considerably more working capital. This device of getting one Government agency in a spot where it has to help Henry to save itself is an old Kaiser trick. He used it to get his magnesium business subsidized and he tried to use it to get an additional tax advantage for his steel company.

The contracts which Kaiser-Frazer were awarded were of course the contracts to build the C-119 and C-123 at Willow Run. Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., an old, established airplane manufacturer, had developed the C-119 and stood ready to produce it at a price for less than anything Kaiser-Frazer could hope to offer. When it was suggested that strategic distribution was the object rather than the price, Fairchild offered to produce the plane in Chicago at the same low price. Nevertheless, this experienced low-cost producer was brushed aside and the contracts were awarded to a very shaky company run

by a man who had continually demonstrated his inability to operate without Government subsidy and who had shown a particular lack of ability when it came to aircraft production.

We have mentioned Walston S. Brown, and John A. McCone as possible links in Henry Kaiser's chain of influence. Another good possibility is Clay Bedford, executive vice president of Kaiser-Frazer, who became first assistant to the Defense Mobilization Director in June 1951, and has since been also appointed special assistant to the Secretary of Defense and now is back with Kaiser.

The story that I have sketched for you so briefly is not the story of the C-119 or the C-123 or of the RFC or of ship-building profits. The story is that of one man, Henry Kaiser, and of how that one man has fattened himself at the public trough for a period of over 10 years. We cannot hope to untie all the knots in this unholy tangle but we are in a position to free the present defense effort from the bloodletting habits of this human leech and we are also in a position to bar the RFC door to any more of his raids. Since Kaiser and the RFC always work together in silence, it is known that negotiations are under way for a further loan at this very moment. As a matter of fact, from what I know about the present financial condition of Kaiser-Frazer, I strongly suspect that negotiations are in fact going forward at lightning speed.

Gentlemen, this problem can never be solved by piecemeal investigations into various places where the poison has struck. It can only be wiped out by elimination of the source, the dispenser of evil, the bloodsucker growing fatter with every gasp of the American taxpayer.

It is the duty of this Congress, as protectors of the American people, to investigate Henry Kaiser, in all his many guises, to lay bare his methods and his sources of power and to thus assure that this man and these methods shall not continue to thrive on the perils of his country.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, general debate is closed and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mutual Security Act of 1952."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. VORYS) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, May 27, 1952, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE CASE FOR GENERAL COLSON

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has had an unusual and extended opportunity to observe the outstanding service of Brig. Gen. Charles F. Colson, while he was commanding general at Fort Devens, Mass., and as one who is conversant to a considerable degree with his distinguished record of service in the Army, I have been very much upset and deeply concerned by the most regrettable turn of events, and comments and insinuations in the press regarding his part in the unfortunate Kojie prison-camp incident.

Not many months ago, General Colson left Fort Devens, where he was respected and beloved by all for his fine, able, humane administration, to take up his new assignment in Korea. Like every good soldier, he left with genuine enthusiasm in his heart and mind to continue his loyal, conscientious, conspicuous service in a theater of active combat; in fact he appeared to me as a man eager and actually straining at the leash to move into the conflict against our Korean enemies.

It was, therefore, only by mere chance, one might say, or as the result of the operation of a strange turn of destiny that he happened to be on the scene when General Dodd was taken captive and the uprising of prisoners began. There was no time to lose. He did not have time to map details of strategy or policy. Clearly, General Dodd's life was at stake. Could anyone doubt that his captors were fanatical Reds and desperate men? Was there reasonable doubt that they would not gravely injure or slay him? General Colson did not stall, hedge, or delay. He acted with prompt decision and his action unquestionably saved the life of General Dodd.

Morally, ethically, legally, and in every other sense his action was amply warranted. The moral and civil law is clear on the point of the invalidity and nullity of agreements arrived at under duress.

I will not argue that point because it is well established by centuries of precedents and cannot be refuted. Any agreements made to save General Dodd's life were of no binding effect on anyone and that fact is known to every moralist, every religionist, and every competent lawyer. Why then all this tirade about General Colson? Is there any sound reason why he should be made the goat for the errors and mistakes of others in the management of enemy prison camps? To my mind, the prisoner situation should be cleared up. Prisoners should be treated decently and humanely and in strict accord with The Hague Convention, but they should not be allowed to riot, create disorder and rebellion in the camps. Above all, under no circumstances should they be permitted to take over, dominate, and control the places in which they are incarcerated.

In my opinion, on the facts I have available at present, instead of censuring or criticizing him, the Army should decorate General Colson for his wisdom and courage in acting promptly, fearlessly and regardless of his own career, interest, and welfare in saving the life of General Dodd.

His was a brave, unselfish act in accordance with the best traditions of the Army. It should be appropriately recognized.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FULBRIGHT AMENDMENT TO DPA HITS THE NEW ENGLAND UNEMPLOYED TEXTILE WORKERS WHILE THEY ARE DOWN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, if this amendment passes, the South will win another victory against the hard-pressed textile mills of New England and their thousands of unemployed workers who have no other jobs to go to.

Both the CIO and the A. F. of L. are bitterly opposed to it, and the facts are all on their side.

This amendment would scrap the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act under which the Secretary of Labor can set hours of labor, minimum wages, and child-labor standards on all Federal contracts of \$10,000 or more for the manufacture and supplying of goods needed by the United States Government.

The Supreme Court has upheld the act which the Fulbright amendment now attempts to nullify.

The Civil War is being fought all over again in the field of economics, and the South is gaining victories by seceding from the clear intent of the law. It has blocked the channeling of defense contracts to distressed areas. It has turned a deaf ear to our plea for emergency legislation that will increase and extend unemployment compensation benefits to critical areas. And now it is active in turning the clock back to the unwriting of progressive laws, so that they can kid-

nap industries from the North by beating down the decent standards that we in the Northeast have won through real collective bargaining and progressive legislation.

Our situation in New England textiles is desperate. The facts are plain, unexaggerated, and heartrending to anyone who knows that economics is not solely a subject concerned with plants, and machinery, and contracts, and costs. Stripped of all its jargon, it means the ability of a human being to earn a living. When that livelihood is stolen from him by tricky legislative maneuvers, his very existence is under attack.

We have as many as 20,000 such victims in cities with a population of 100,000 and under up New England way.

The Defense Production Administration and the Surplus Manpower Committee, after much shadow-boxing, have not quite concealed their conclusions which boil down to this; they do not consider it their job to save the Northern textile industry; but they will try to relieve unemployment.

They are not even doing that.

Rosy plans to build defense plants that will take up the slack, look fine on paper. But you cannot put our unemployed textile workers into mothballs and tell them to wait in suspended animation for a solution built on promises and little else.

I have spoken of the apathy here in Washington to the plight of New England.

But this amendment is a direct thrust at our unemployed.

I do not criticize it because it was conceived in a spirit of sectional ambition, reaching to take advantage of an opportune moment. Such maneuvers are usually considered to be enterprising.

But this will swell the ranks of the jobless in New England, and I cannot imagine any American consciously and deliberately assuming responsibility for such a tragedy.

The way to progress and unity is not by undercutting the better living standards that American workers have won. Rather, we should help those whose wages are now substandard. That is the policy of the United States Government, established by law, in the award of contracts under its direct jurisdiction.

The Fulbright amendment is shortsighted, narrow, and dangerous.

For a local and temporary gain, it would set back national improvement in the status of American workers.

They are the customers of American industry.

If this amendment should pass, public opinion will overrule it on November 4.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MALADMINISTRATION OF THE ISLAND GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY OF GUAM

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, last December the gentleman from New York,

Mr. CHRISTOPHER McGRATH; the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and I visited the island of Guam on our return from an inspection tour of the trust islands, Japan, and the Korean war front.

Guam, as you know, was governed by the Navy until August 1, 1950, when it was placed under United States civilian control, and a Governor was appointed by President Truman, who still holds that office.

The island of Guam is approximately 6 miles wide and 30 miles in length and has a native Guamanian population of about 40,000, an armed forces population of about 30,000, and a United States mainland citizen population of about 30,000, or a total population of approximately 100,000 people in all.

The United States American citizen population, commonly referred to in Guam as Stateside, pay a United States Federal income tax, as do all other American citizens; however, it is not sent to the United States Treasury, but is kept in the Guam treasury and spent there for the functions of the Guam government.

On that small island, which is one of our most important military outposts in the Pacific, every branch of our Armed Forces is stationed. In addition to the officials of the Armed Forces and our civilian government, the native Guamanians elect their congress, which is composed of 21 members, hence you may well understand the problems which arise on that small island with so many kinds of governing heads.

Many members of Congress including myself, opposed the transfer from Navy control to United States civilian control before the change was made because Guam is primarily a military outpost, and by all means it should be turned back to the Navy at the earliest possible time in light of the conditions there, and especially since Guam is so close to the Korean theater of war.

While we were in Guam last December we heard rumblings of discontent from people in several of the segments about their economy.

Several weeks ago two gentlemen, who have lived in Guam for years, and who have held responsible positions there, came to Washington on their own initiative and at their own expense, to make the following report to the United States Congress. They are William McKinley and Norman A. Peltier, both citizens of the United States.

We are informed that Governor Skinner is in Washington, D. C., now, hence we are bringing the charges of these two gentlemen to the attention of Congress at this time in order to give Governor Skinner an opportunity to answer these charges while here if he desires to do so. Every American citizen is entitled to his day in court, and I am sure the proper committees of Congress will be only too glad to give him a full hearing on request.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now read the report submitted to us by Mr. McKinley

and Mr. Peltier, without further comment on my part:

MALADMINISTRATION OF THE ISLAND GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY OF GUAM

1. It is the desire of the undersigned to bring to the attention of the United States Congress certain facts and allegations relative to fraud, graft, corruption, and mismanagement within the Territorial Government of the Government of Guam.

2. Due to the number of contracts that have been let and the sly manner in which they have been handed to select people and the fact that there is no adequate control of Government funds, the door is wide open to graft and kick-backs.

If the income-tax returns and bank accounts of the 15 to 18 officials, past and present, in key positions were to be checked and a similar check and cross check were made of the people who have been doing such big business with the Government of Guam, in the same manner that the Treasury agents break the rackets in the United States, one of the most fascinating income-tax frauds will be disclosed.

If there is a bank deposit placed with a bank in San Francisco, and checks on Government of Guam are drawn on it, no one in Guam outside of those issuing the checks would know who was being paid large sums of money.

Attorneys Phinton J. Phelan, Jr., and Edward E. Crain, Agana, Guam, filed a taxpayers' suit against the Government of Guam alleging that the income tax levied in Guam was illegal.

It was dismissed in Guam, as are all suits against the Government.

The case was argued in San Francisco, Calif., Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on February 29, 1952. It is rumored the case may be thrown out on jurisdictional grounds, but the judge made the comment from the bench that they will hold, at the first opportunity, that there is no tax. They indicated that this tax was a fast deal pulled by Interior Governor Skinner, Attorney General Knight Aulsbrook, and Oliphant, formerly of the Department of Internal Revenue.

Governor Skinner told certain members of the Guam Chamber of Commerce that if the question of clarifying taxes out there got to the United States Congress it might wipe out Federal tax sections 30 and 31, possibly taking all moneys collected by authority of Federal law from Guam and giving it all to the United States Treasury. It is believed he is afraid Congress will look at his budget and what he is doing with the money.

The receipts from the sale of the Guam News, the Bank of Guam, and the rehabilitation fund, etc., were not mentioned in the organic act and are probably Federal funds. The government of Guam has been spending these funds as they see fit. The total is between \$2,000,000 and \$3,000,000. It is suspected they are all gone.

On the rehabilitation fund, there is an opinion of the JAG of the Navy that those funds should be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the United States Treasury.

3. The students of the George Washington High School and the Catholic schools held an oratorical contest in the Guam Congress building in February 1952. It was reported by the officials of the government of Guam that the children were so bad they will have to be watched, as they are saying things detrimental to the government of Guam. It is reported R. S. Herman, secretary of Guam, threatened the students and stated he will censor all graduation speeches and that the children cannot take part in any more oratorical debates. The children

merely told the truth about the whole rotten government in a contest.

Excerpts of the speeches were published in the Guam Examiner:

"WHAT THEY SAID"

"In any contest, there are losers as well as winners. The keener the contest, the more difficult it is to declare the victors.

"Last fortnight, the judges had to make decisions in the semifinal and final oratorical contests at the Guam Congress Building. Both were sponsored by the local Lions Club. Notwithstanding the decisions, popular acclaim made it conspicuously clear that all the young high-school orators were winners; not so much as contestants, but as responsible, wide-awake citizens who demonstrated—too painfully for some—that they can be depended upon to preserve the precious heritage of Americanism.

"Here are thought-provoking excerpts from the oratories of the contestants:

"Jose San Agustin (Duenas Memorial, 1): 'Among the historic rights obtained only after centuries of struggle * * * are those of freedom of speech and of the press. Some innocent persons imagine that these rights are unlimited and confer the license to say anything or print anything that may be desired. * * * These rights are restricted insofar as they include slander, indecency, incitement to rebellion, and similar offenses against the public welfare. Even if statements of indecency are based on facts, freedom of speech does not permit their utterance lest public morals be contaminated.'

"Annie Underwood (Academy of Our Lady, 2): 'The halls ring with the noise of the oratory of men and the rafters absorb their meaningless clatter of phrases. What we really need is a more thorough knowledge of the laws that govern us, instead of the nonsense of what kind of treatment we receive in court after crimes have been committed. Our island will not be improved by swinging human windmills and empty words; it will be bettered only by knowledge of the facts. * * * I dare say that many Guamanians have no idea what the organic act means, nor do they understand the privileges and the duties which are theirs because of that act. We Guamanians who are now American citizens should endeavor in every way possible to prove ourselves worthy of the great heritage which is now ours to enjoy.'

"Randolph Carbullido (Duenas Memorial, 3): 'If we are not wise and enlightened by spiritual values, we may not be a democracy in the future * * * Today, we * * * have to be ever watchful that our Government does not become too powerful, because a powerful government is almost inevitably bad and sooner rather than later, it ceases to be a servant and becomes a master of the citizens. * * * In future elections * * * let us study our rights, let us assert our prerogative, let us not be blinded by sweet promises which are discarded as soon as the candidates are elected.'

"Pedro Guerrero (Duenas Memorial): 'All our rights are God-given. Where God is denied and society is permitted to operate without Him, these rights cease to exist * * * We must have a responsible authority that enforces law without casting aside the laws of God. We must have a police force that understands its obligations and conscientiously tries to fulfill them; we must have a board of education that teaches us the road-map to success on earth and eternal happiness in heaven.'

"Salvador Camacho (Washington High): 'Why should we be denied some of the rights which our fellow citizens are enjoying? Are we not equally created? Or is there such a term as secondary citizenship? The denial of the rights of indictment by grand jury, and trial by jury are two excellent examples

of denial of rights * * * to American citizens here in Guam. * * * Also denied partially is the right of just compensation for land taken for public use. * * * Persons having titles to the land used for the Agana school ground are paid rental fees ranging from \$1.50 to \$3.50 per month. * * * Has any step been taken by our Guam legislature or by the Governor himself toward securing these rights?"

"Gloria Camacho (Academy of Our Lady): 'Today, when times are critical, when the tide of democracy is slowly ebbing, when communism is threatening all the free countries of the world, we should more than ever abide by the Constitution, obey its laws and defend it from persons who are trying to wreck our ideals of freedom, and who are trying to poison the minds of many to follow their false ideas. We should see that good and able representatives are elected in order to secure the passage of just laws.'

"Bernadita Perez (Academy of Our Lady): 'Many people have the courage to write about what is true, but there are many who are afraid to do so. * * * The man in the village and the woman in the home who lack a channel of free, uncensored information and receive their news from a distorted, mutilated, and misdirected press live with the eyes of their minds blindfolded in the night of unfairness. * * * Freedom of the press is a heritage of the people. Newspapermen are pledged to and are defending it today just as soldiers are defending our liberties, for liberty belongs to mankind.'

"Nancy Pangelinan (Washington High): 'The Constitution is not alone the working plan of a great federation of States under representative government. There are imbedded in it also the vital principles of the American system of liberty. That system is based upon certain inalienable freedoms and which we call the Bill of Rights. Among others, the freedom of worship * * * of speech and of the press, the right of peaceable assembly, equality before the law, just trial * * * freedom from unreasonable search, and security from being deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.'

In the same issue of the Guam Examiner appeared the following editorial:

"A LETTER TO HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

"This is written for you who are in our high schools today, especially for those of you who are to graduate at the end of the academic year.

"It will be a long time, if ever, before you forget the oratorical contest last month in the hall of the Guam Legislature. We feel you will be interested to know it wasn't long after the final competition that reports from widely different sources began reaching us—about the reaction in diverse quarters to the oratories of your fellow students.

"There have been few events here that have stirred so much interest. People still talk about it today. We want to assure you that the overwhelming majority of the population are pleasingly gratified by the manifestation in this contest of true, courageous Americanism by young representative citizens. On the other hand, you must accept as a cold, hard, inevitability the fact that a minority segment of island residents will have only contempt for those who dare to exercise their rights.

"The general criticism is to the effect that the contestants are mouthpieces of certain individuals and organizations. Don't let this disturb you at all. You can readily recognize this as a cowardly, sour-grapes statement that can come only from intellectual lepers—people whose guilty consciences continue to suffer from the pain of mental abscess. They don't belong to any respectable community.

"How do these people get that way? There are various causes of this malady. But it is basically due to a self-acquired affliction of personal dishonesty which has made it painful for them to accept the truth. They are moral weaklings whose criterion of right and wrong are not based on God's law but on the amount of political, economic, and social blessings they aspire to earn.

"If, indeed, the contestants are mouthpieces, we hope they are the mouthpieces of spiritual leaders, parents, and teachers. For their utterances are expressions of moral beliefs that all of you should be taught in your church, at home, and in school. Your high-school diploma will mean nothing if you graduate without learning these tenets of good citizenship.

"You eventually will select different careers in the years to come. In the practice of your profession—however humble it may be—you will have to make many very important decisions. You will find that in making them you will be confronted also with the necessity of making a choice that may be the turning point in your life.

"You will be guided by many factors; but none of these will be as important as the moral principles that govern human existence. You will discover that you cannot align yourself with God without alienating the devil; that you cannot pitch your tent among good men without being required to sever your association with evil ones. You will find too, that for men and women who espouse righteousness, it is an honorable distinction to be despised by scoundrels.

"These, and more, you will find out for yourselves sooner than most of you think right now. And you may have to give up precious material things to gain the respect and admiration of good and honest citizens. It will be worth the sacrifices you may have to make."

4. That Governor Skinner can no longer control the Guamanian and that they are meeting secretly to defy him and the following is a quote from the Guam Daily News: 'Rumors are flying about a group of prominent Guamanian businessmen and political leaders who held a meeting recently at Palting Ranch from which all Statesiders were barred.

"Here is what some of the speakers discussed:

"One point discussed was the exploitation of Guamanians by Stateside lawyers on land dealings.

"Some of the feeling by those present was against selling land to Statesiders but instead to lease it.

"The group, 200 strong, will meet again on March 23. Membership is \$5 and highly restricted."

Publisher Joseph Flores conferred at great length with persons who heard the organization mentioned in the above story.

The committee stated the group was not antiadministration nor discriminatory. Instead they said the objectives of the organization were to bring the Guamanian people together to provide scholarships for deserving students and promote better government and other worth-while programs.

5. That the personnel department is so inefficient and mismanaged that many persons were hired off island and that the positions were so misrepresented that the persons hired left the island at intervals of from 2 days to 4 months and at government expense.

6. That the Territorial and island courts are puppets of the Governor of Guam and dispense only "injustice."

7. That many department heads, both Stateside and native, are unqualified to hold their positions, professionally or otherwise.

8. In 1950 all department heads raised their salaries to GS-14 plus 25 percent TPD to

cover income tax payments. This done with approval of Governor Skinner.

9. That the former treasurer of the government of Guam, Ike Warren, and Simeon Provencher, supply officer of the government of Guam, shipped in taxable goods, using government bills of lading as favor to local merchant (Stateside) to avoid payment of duty and transportation. They received expensive gifts at Christmas—such as sets of golf clubs, bicycles, etc.

10. That Knight Aulsbrook, attorney general of Guam, boasted of his close association with Alger Hiss. That he roomed with Hiss in law school and was a close friend while in Washington, and that Mrs. Aulsbrook and Mrs. Hiss were good friends.

12. Guam News, October 22, 1951, published the following:

"A. Exactly what did Guamanians get for the \$50,000 paid the Public Administration Service of Chicago?

"B. Why is a new hospital being built when \$2,000,000 worth of what could be one stands overgrown by boondocks, north of Tolofoto?

"C. Why did orders for dental supplies 'get lost' while Guamanians were turned away without needed care?

"D. Is former Fire Marshal Peltier's contract being fulfilled to the letter?

"E. Why are positive cases of TB allowed at large on Guam?

"F. Isn't it time for the name of Scambelluri to be cleared? (Former lieutenant of police resigned after trumped up charges were dismissed and his refusal to take orders from chief of police and his assistant who are ex-convicts and who were originally arrested by Scambelluri.)

"H. Why, with the great number of traffic violations, are the granting of liquor licenses not curtailed?

"I. What is the reason for wealthy Guamanians leaving Guam?

"J. Who put the organic act over? (IPR)."

13. Under section 15, article 3, of Public Law 33 (Public Land Act), Governor Skinner appointed a five-man Territorial planning commission subject to confirmation by the legislature to propose and adopt a comprehensive long-term general plan for the physical and economic land development of Guam, the master plan.

In connection with this project and others under the administration's 10-year construction program, the government has obtained the services of two experienced planners and architects, Robert Alexander and Richard Neutra, as consultants.

Terms of a contract between the consultants and the Territorial government provide for a retainer fee of \$25,000 yearly for 10 years in addition to travel costs and living expenses, also to be paid by the Government.

Neutra and Alexander also will receive not more than a maximum of \$75,000 for any one year's services other than as consultants retained by the government.

The consultants will interview personnel for prospective employment in projects connected with the 10-year plan. The contract also stipulates that the consultants will receive two and one-half times the wages and salaries paid to personnel hired for projects under the plan. Manuel F. Leon Guerrero, director of land management and executive secretary of the planning commission, interpreted this item in the contract in this way: If a worker receives \$10 an hour on a project, under the consultants, the consultants will be paid \$25 by the government, \$10 of which goes to the employee.

Neutra and Alexander also will study the Territorial government's annual capital investment through the completion of the 10-year plan in 1962.

14. That the police and fire departments which constitute the department of public safety are headed by incompetents. That the chief of police, Roberto, and the assistant chief of police, Juan Manibusan, are ex-convicts and that 32 members of the police and fire departments have criminal records. This has been brought to the attention of the officials of the Government of Guam and to date nothing has been done about it.

The assistant chief of police, Juan Manibusan, was recommended for attendance at the National Police Academy conducted by the FBI in Washington even though Mandeville C. Frost, the then commissioner of public safety, was aware that he had a record for grand larceny and had a bad conduct discharge from the United States Navy. As a result of this recommendation, letters were forwarded to J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. Governor Skinner was advised by letter from J. Edgar Hoover to withdraw his recommendation of Manibusan's attendance.

The police department is overmanned and has one commissioned or noncommissioned officer for each two patrolmen. Many of the men can neither read nor write.

The majority of the police have an overbearing attitude and any person who opposes the actions or thoughts of the administration are subjected to Gestapo treatment.

Many members use the power of their badge to borrow money and run up bills which they never intend to return or pay.

Food and building materials, etc., are removed by members of the police department from Ordot Prison and are converted to private life.

Government vehicles are used by members of the department for private enterprise.

Many members, including officers, are operating liquor establishments in addition to their employment by the department.

When Michael Brennan, Red Cross field director, was murdered by a taxi driver in January 1950, the murderer was recently sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined \$10. Why?

The deposed commissioner of public safety, Mandeville C. Frost, was involved in an attempted extortion racket involving the sale of parcels to prisoners for \$1,500.

He was cleared by an investigation conducted by Edward Bender, former assistant attorney general (resigned) who also is purported to have been involved in the plot. Frost then investigated and cleared one Jose Leon Guerrero, a police sergeant, the alleged collector. He was brought before the court as the result of a congressional investigation and the case was dismissed because as the judge stated, the man was prosecuted on the wrong charges, and he (the judge) knew the man was guilty.

In January 1951 Norman A. Peltier, fire marshal, was requested to resign because of a difference of opinion between Mrs. Peltier and Commissioner Frost. As he refused to resign he was informed that as Mrs. Peltier was reported to have been a vice crusader in California, she was not wanted on the island. At the request of Albert Slaughter, personnel director, Mr. Peltier was not bothered until March 1951 when he was again requested to resign. He was given an ultimatum to the effect: Resign without prejudice and transportation will be furnished for him and his family back to the United States, but if he fought it he would be blackballed in all Government agencies and his family stranded on Guam. The family is on Guam and Mr. Peltier in Washington, fighting for the right to earn a living for his family.

During his employment there Mr. Peltier served as assistant to the commissioner,

chief criminal investigator, and fire marshal. During his tenure as fire marshal he not only organized and trained the fire department, but actually built the equipment being used by that unit at practically no expense to the Government.

He was discharged summarily without trial on the basis of an alleged Army report that Mr. Peltier was unfit to be a Government employee.

The Army in a letter to Mr. Peltier stated no such report existed and refused to accept his tendering of his resignation as a first lieutenant, Military Intelligence Corps, United States Army Reserve.

During Mr. Peltier's absence from the Island of Guam his family have been harassed on numerous occasions by the official politburo of the Government of Guam. For example, we quote, August 27, 1951, editorial from the Guam Daily News:

"GESTAPO TACTICS"

"Everyone undoubtedly agrees the Guam police had a legal right last week to throw the Peltier family into the street. They, the police, were backed up by a court order. The case, officially at least, was closed, and eviction proceedings had been under way for something like 3 months. But we question the methods used, methods which began to look like a war of nerves, not a simple eviction action. We can't see that the quarters occupied by Mrs. Peltier and her two sons, needed an armed police guard 24 hours a day.

"Reason given was that the furniture and fixtures needed guarding. Mrs. Peltier with no place to go, could hardly carry off an easy chair, bed or sofa. One police guard said he was on duty there because of 'valuables' inside. Government of Guam furniture, no matter what else, can rarely be put in that category. During the guarding process, a press representative was twice barred by police from entering the house to interview Mrs. Peltier. When it was determined eviction papers did not need to be served, the police continued to stick around under orders. To top it off, after the eviction was suspended following orders for a new investigation in the Peltier case from Washington, the police went home only to return the same evening again. Outside the home, police have trailed the young son of the former marshal, on orders from headquarters, on the highway and in the housing area. He was threatened with vagrancy charges for 'prowl' near the women's area. The boy claims he was not in the area and at any rate the area was not restricted at that time. Meanwhile, the Government's plea is that they are sorry for the Peltier family and wish to do all they can to help. The commissioner of public safety called the whole affair minor."

COMMERCIAL PORT

15. The commercial port facility is operated by a former Guam congressman, Jose Leon Guerrero, who helped establish the position and then resigned his position as congressman to accept the appointment as director of commerce at a salary of \$7,000 per annum. He is a former clerk at the Naval Supply Depot and held minor positions in the Government of Guam and is unqualified to head such an operation.

The entire operation is in chaos; pilferage and damage claims are beyond reason. In the past innumerable false claims have been made against the operation by local merchandizers.

When Governor Skinner made Guam a free port, thereby eliminating customs duties, all search of incoming vessels was suspended due to the elimination of the custom force. This made the Guam port accessible for the movement of illegal goods such as smuggled precious stones, narcotics,

etc., without any fear of apprehension by the authorities. One of the vessels which uses Guam as a home port is a motor vessel *Arctic*, owned and operated by one Captain Schofield in partnership with a local merchant, Joseph Siciliano. Both men are notoriously known for their alleged illicit operations in and around Manila, such as gun running, black market, etc. Their names are linked with those of Charles Forte, Ted Lewin, Charles Murray (murdered), all well known to ONI, OSI, and Military Intelligence. A complete investigation of these men was made but the report was suppressed by Mandeville C. Frost, former commissioner of public safety, and is believed to be in his possession or to have been destroyed.

Of recent date in their effort to stamp out the traffic in narcotics and illegal operations the *Arctic* was stopped and searched by an armed boarding party of naval personnel. At this writing according to information received from Guam, the *Arctic* is now under marine guard and government of Guam officials have been denied access to the vessel. Captain Schofield was also picked up by the naval authorities. The reasons for this action are unknown to the writers. Captain Schofield is Governor Skinner's appointed head of the Government of Guam Port Authority and occupies government quarters.

That the Government of Guam official family is a clique more interested in lining their own pockets than in running a government for the Guamanian peoples—some of the officials are engaged in other occupations other than that for which hired. The personnel director is local manager for a Seattle creamery and several others are engaged in business using their wives as a front.

Investigate disposition of Government of Guam public works funds—roads (except those in village) maintained by Navy who also run water and power and light systems and telephone hook-up on island. Power, water, and road conditions in most villages are in an extremely pitiful condition.

The following editorial from the Guam Weekly Examiner speaks for a vast majority of the peoples of Guam:

"[From Guam Weekly Examiner of March 20, 1952]

"A LETTER FROM A HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENT"

"(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This letter was delivered at the last minute and we consider it timely and important enough to deserve the space on this page. The author is a real, living person—and a 19-year-old American.)

"I am a boy who is very observant of my environment.

"On March 12, I was surprised to find a 'letter to the editor' written by an Elizabeth S. Somebody, on the front page of the Guam Daily News. At first, I thought it was something very interesting that the public should know.

"But reading on down the lines, I discovered it was all filled with flowery talks about a dream of a beautiful city, Agana. I feel that through no other medium than the Guam Examiner can the public know of my opinion of this letter.

"Yes, who will not like Agana to look beautiful? Who will not like Agana to be blocked with buildings like the Guam Daily News? But who will not also like Agana to be dwelt by people who own part of Agana? I would say that if Agana is dwelt by people who used to dwell there, of course with a little improvement here and there, the dream of a beautiful Agana can be made to come true. We need not accept the idea brought forth by the editor of the Guam Daily News. His ideas are merely personal opinions which cannot be adapted to the

problems now encountering the present administration of the Government of Guam. Persons who write letters and editorials about Guam's domestic problems such as 'Mysterious Beth' and Editor Jack Nevin have knowledge of the history of Guam and its people.

"On March 13, in response to 'Mysterious Beth's' letter the Governor informed the public that he will take all necessary steps to protect the capital city of Guam from imminent danger of being blocked with slums as Beth had called them. The Governor should have taken such steps earlier. He should have thought of that a long time ago. We had trusted our governor to be a good one. And being a good governor, we trust him to do some planning for the future. Waiting until some mysterious 'Beth' brings thing out is not the proper time to make a decision and command some action. I know that the Governor and other government officials went on a tour of Rota, Tintian, and other islands. (This junket was made aboard the *Reliable* owned by Joseph Flores, Daily News editor and publisher, and included some members of the legislature.—Editor's note.)

I believe they did the right thing. I personally agree that it is about time they take a week-end vacation to relieve their minds of domestic problems. There are so many of them that need attention, such as: Providing public schools with the right kind of teachers, and proper facilities; lessening the number of fatal accidents; providing proper means of communication; providing a better, if not the best, type of fire-fighting crew and equipment; establishing recreational centers to diminish juvenile delinquency; and many others which will require a good size book to record them all.

"But I also know that the Governor as a leader and the Congressmen as leaders also, will have to sit down and make a thorough examination of their conscience and see whether or not they have been doing their best to help the public whom they are serving.

"They must not forget that they are getting paid to do their jobs, and to do them in the best possible manner. Also, they must not forget and overlook the fact that some of them have secured governmental positions, and now that they have them take advantage and use them wisely.

"They must think first before they act and must take precautions as well. Their aim is to act to please the majority of whom they are serving and not the minority.

"The idea of putting a stop to the business of trucking into Agana junk, rusty Quonsets, and rotten prefabs which might kill the beauty that has been planned in, in all respects, a good idea.

"But I doubt very sincerely if there would be a man or a group of men who can make the people living in Agana change completely the type of housing they are living in from remodeled, rusty Quonsets and rotten prefabs which are more pleasant to live in at times, to newly constructed modern buildings which might lead some people to serving sentence in the Guam Penitentiary. (Salvador Lujan Comacho, senior, Washington High School.)"

"An investigation should be made of the conditions prevailing at the Guam Memorial Hospital.

"The qualifications of the Medical Director, who is alleged to have resigned from the United States Army Medical Corps in lieu of a general court martial" (Dr. Wendell Mathias).

"Abuses heaped on and exploitation of DP doctors. Two doctors were censured and an attempt made to discharge them because

they refused to perform a sterilization operation.

"Inadequate medical supplies and equipment.

"Director of personnel at hospital, William Silverman, was rejected by Dr. J. Y. Battenfield, former director of medical services. Dr. Battenfield left island because he was forced to accept unqualified man for position" (Silverman).

"Information received from Guam states that Governor Skinner has indicated that William C. McKinley will never be allowed to return to the island of Guam and that Norman A. Peltier likewise will be banned for his aid to McKinley in this exposé in Washington."

SUMMARY

The following is a summary of allegations of maladministration of the Territorial government of Guam.

1. Income tax frauds by officials of government of Guam.
2. Kickbacks and contract favoritism
3. Territorial income tax for Guam illegal.
4. Where are funds from sale of Guam News, Bank of Guam and rehabilitation fund?
5. Suppression of free speech in schools.
6. Irregularities in police department, including employment of ex-convicts.
7. Santos-Guerrero extortion case.
8. Brennan murder.
9. Administration of personnel office.
10. Public works funds.
11. Guam Memorial Hospital.
12. Illegal removal of fire marshal.
13. Abuses to family of fire marshal.
14. Island and territorial courts, incompetent United States attorney.
15. Juvenile delinquency.
16. Smuggling, narcotics, etc.
17. Irregularities in land sales and seizures.
18. Mismanagement of government quarters.
19. Commercial port.

PERSONAL HISTORY

Norman A. Peltier: Date of birth: May 3, 1908. Place of birth: Boston, Mass. United States address: 229 Hillcrest Avenue., Benicia, Calif. Marital status: married, two children; Education: elementary and high schools, Boston, Mass.; Northeastern University, Boston, Mass. Military: United States Marines, 1928-33 (aviation); served in Haiti, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua; United States Coast Guard, 1942-46, security officer; United States Army, military intelligence officer, commission still active. Civilian occupation: Massachusetts State Police, 1933-47 (resigned); 1946-48, chief safety and security, Benicia Arsenal, Calif., with duties of provost marshal, fire marshal, intelligence officer, safety director and port captain; 1949-51, Guam, safety inspector United States Navy, Assistant to Commissioner of Public Safety, chief criminal investigator, and fire marshal, naval government and civil Government of Guam.

William C. McKinley: Date of birth, August 13, 1912. Place of birth: Cleveland, Ohio. United States address: 2755 Woodshire Drive, Hollywood 28, Calif. Marital status: single. Education: Elementary and high school, Cleveland, Ohio; Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Sawyer's Business College, Los Angeles, Calif. Military: United States Army, 1942-44. Civilian occupation: 1931-36, chief of police, Lorain, Ohio; 1936-40, chief, Ohio State Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation; 1940-42, general superintendent, Jack & Heintz, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio; 1942-44, United States Army, investigations; 1944-46, Twentieth Century-

Fox, special security officer; 1947, fraud investigator, State board of equalization, California; 1947-48, investigator, crime laboratory, Los Angeles sheriff's department; 1948-50, naval government of Guam, inspector of police; 1950-52, Vinnell Construction Co., chief security and safety officer. Organizations: 1936-40, president, Ohio State Marshals' Association; 1936-40, president, Ohio Police Chiefs' Association.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGrath], and I when in Guam last December were much disturbed over some of the charges we have heard about. We heard them there. We had called to our attention the charges the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has read, charges made by the two gentleman to whom he has referred. I agree absolutely with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that every opportunity should be given to Governor Skinner, of the island of Guam, to answer these charges, and I am glad the Governor is today in the city of Washington.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In relation to income taxes, it was 2 years ago last November that I was in Guam and discovered then that they were not paying any income taxes. My amendment to the internal-revenue bill, which provided that withholding and income taxes should be paid, but to the Treasury of the United States, was adopted, but in conference the Interior Committee or someone was able to change it so that the taxes are paid now in Guam. These workers over there, both the construction workers and the United States employees, receive extra pay for being out of the United States, but they were paying no taxes any place at all at that time. Of course, the taxes are now being paid in Guam, but they should come here to the United States.

There is another question I want to bring up. I do not know what the gentleman's charges are.

Mr. JENSEN. They are not my charges or our charges, they are the charges of these two gentlemen before our committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In our Committee on Insular Affairs we are discussing now, and I have held up the report on it, a bill which would set up a framework for Guam patterned after the things we do in this country, with a poultry industry, recreation, a Reconstruction Finance Corporation, public housing, and a whole list of things that the left-wingers are pushing in this country as the No. 1 objective. I said "No" the only thing they needed to have as far as Guam was concerned was some legislation relative to immigration and the Narcotics Act. Tomorrow morning,

time permitting, that bill will be up before our committee and I expect to have some remarks to make about it. If it ever comes before the House, I know the gentleman will be interested in it. It involves the setting up of a framework for the government of Guam that the people do not want and the people cannot support.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I know the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has taken a great interest in the problems of all our Territories.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JENISON. I want to commend our distinguished colleague from Iowa on bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress, for certainly it is timely. I share a degree of familiarity with the problems in Guam because I was in Guam in the military service at the time we reoccupied that island, and I have since returned there as a member of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is the concern of all our people that in this transition from military to civilian government we set up a government in keeping with their needs, and not saddle them with a government that will burden them so that it will break down of its very weight. I commend our colleague from Iowa for calling this matter to the attention of the House, and assure him of my interest.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I have not had an opportunity to observe the conditions in Guam since the change-over to civilian government, and I will read the charges with great interest. I take this opportunity to make the observation that I visited Guam in the course of my travels as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs while the island was under naval control. From my recollection, we had a very good report of the control and government of Guam by the Navy throughout the years it was under their jurisdiction. I am a little bit shocked to hear that serious charges are in the making here so soon after Guam was taken away from naval control, which was so successful and so satisfactory.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say to the gentleman that the charges which are made, and which he may hear and will read in the RECORD tomorrow, are quite serious charges. Mr. AUGUST H. ANDERSEN of Minnesota, and Mr. McGRATH, of New York, and I felt it our responsibility as representatives of the American people to bring this matter out in the open and let it be aired in the hope that a proper solution could be arrived at.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. After all,

we have had these things brought to our personal attention, and if there is anything wrong, I think it is our duty in the Congress to give a forum via the proper committee for these people who do express the charges to prove what they have to say, and if there is anything wrong, let us make it right.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I shall read excerpts from these charges. Time will not permit me to read the complete report. The subject is maladministration in the island government in the Territory of Guam. It is the desire of the undersigned to bring to the attention of the United States Congress certain facts and allegations relative to the fraud, graft, corruption and mismanagement within the Territorial government of the government of Guam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McMULLEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PRICE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am astounded that Canadian newsprint manufacturers apparently acting systematically and in unison have once again raised the price of newsprint.

Since VJ-day 1945, the price of newsprint has risen \$56 per ton. Our Canadian neighbors furnish approximately 58 percent of all the newsprint used in the United States. Since VJ-day, as a result of these huge price increases, the newsprint bill of American publishers has gone up more than \$280,000,000 a year.

While there is no price control in Canada, I understand that the latest increase of \$10 per ton to a price of \$126 a ton has been approved by the Government of Canada and will add another \$50,000,000 to the annual newsprint costs of American newspapers.

I understand that the earnings of the Canadian newsprint suppliers indicate that this increase is not required by their financial situation. But the effect here is bound to be most unfavorable upon the newspaper and publishing industry. More than 750 American daily newspapers have suspended publication in the last 20 years. It is also true that a great many of the 1,750 newspapers now published in this country are at present barely able to continue publishing in the light of newsprint price increases. It is fair to assume that many of these publications will be forced to suspend publication, merge, or dispose of their holdings, thus further reducing essential newspaper and press service to the American people.

Shall we admit that this Congress is unable to do anything about this problem, which so vitally concerns the Nation? Free press and free speech are a cornerstone of our entire American system. Are we to stand idly by while Canadian newsprint manufacturers, acting in concert with every indication of

a ruthless monopoly, take another more dangerous strangle hold upon the American press?

I have protested this matter to the Department of State and have requested immediate action to try to relieve the situation.

We have cooperated in many ways with our Canadian friends and neighbors and I believe that we are entitled to fair consideration from them in this vital matter. At least they should be willing to protect our free American press from monopolistic and price-gouging practices.

Since I understand that large amounts of newsprint have been purchased from Canadian sources with Marshall-plan and foreign-aid funds, I am urging appropriate officials of that agency to discontinue all such purchases in the future.

Since it is my further understanding that this country is now negotiating for the purchase of large quotas of aluminum from Canadian sources, I am asking officials in charge of these negotiations to withhold action until such time as we can be assured of fair prices for newsprint to our American publishers and newspapers.

Let me add that I have high regard for the Government and people of Canada and I hesitate to say anything here which would reflect in any way upon the fine relations we enjoy with them. However, the Government and the people of Canada are evidently to be distinguished from the gang of economic buccaners, who have rigged up the unconscionable plan to mulct our American newspaper industry.

Unless we can secure fair prices for Canadian newsprint, it is clear to me that we shall have to explore other possibilities of sources of supply, including synthetic manufacturing so as to free our newspaper industry of what seems to be plain extortion.

There is another phase of this question, which I intend to explore—the effect, if any, of price-fixing rulings by OPS upon the supply of pulpwood, which is used in making newsprint. Every angle of this matter should be scrupulously explored and I am calling for vigorous action on the part of appropriate Government officials to try to find a solution to a situation that threatens our newspapers and publishing industry, indeed, our free press.

I am also bringing this matter to the attention of the President so that he may take such action as to him seems fitting in the dire circumstances.

[From Editor and Publisher of May 17, 1952]
BRITISH PRESS ENJOYS NEWSPRINT PRICE CUT
(By Doris Willens)

LONDON.—Fatter newspapers and cheaper newsprint are on the way for Britain.

As of May 19 the controlled price of newsprint will be reduced by \$8 a ton from the current price of about \$188 a ton. A larger reduction is expected in the second half of the year.

"The situation has changed in a most remarkable way," F. P. Bishop, chairman of the Newsprint Supply Co., said.

"We have passed almost overnight from a seller's market to a buyer's market in news-

print. The long-term cause is that consumption in the United States has been flattening out for the last few months while production in North America has been increasing.

"The short-term cause is that many markets have suddenly collapsed, Argentina, for example, and we have been able to take some of their supplies at a lower price and build up stock."

The Scandinavians this week offered Britain 73,000 tons for the second half of 1952—25,000 tons more than in the first half of the year. They also agreed to sell at about \$55 a ton less than the old price.

In addition, British newsprint plants have been increasing their output by speeding up machinery. By March 1953, new machinery being installed by the Imperial Paper Mills should be running. This has a total capacity of 35,000 tons yearly.

Bowaters have made plans to construct a new machine with a 70,000-ton-a-year capacity at the Kemsley mills.

One of the first results of the cheaper newsprint and the increased supplies of it will be reduced advertising rates. Lord Beaverbrook's Daily Express set the pattern of passing reductions in costs along to advertisers several years ago. The paper has promised to do the same again. And as the Express goes, so goes Fleet Street.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LESINSKI and to include a speech he delivered on May 3.

Mr. RAMSAY on H. R. 287, pertaining to instructions to the jury and the right of the court to comment on the weight of the evidence.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMAS and to include an editorial appearing in the Houston Post of May 18.

Mr. MEADER to revise and extend his remarks on the mutual security bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK and to include a quotation from a paper.

Mr. ROSS and to include a speech by Mr. T. V. Houser, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$189.

Mr. HALE and to include a letter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORTON and to include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SADLAK and to include a resolution.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL in three instances.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include an editorial.

Mr. MURDOCK in two instances and in one to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SITTLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include an address by Admiral W. K. Phillips on Armed Services Day in New Orleans.

Mr. BLATNIK and to include a magazine article.

Mr. WILLIS and to include an editorial. Mr. VORYS and to include tables in the remarks he made today.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. VORYS) in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. VORYS) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE (at the request of Mr. VORYS).

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. VORYS) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. CARNAHAN) and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 148. An act for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft;

S. 420. An act for the relief of Gloria Wilson;

S. 603. An act for the relief of Wanda Charwat, and her daughter, Wanda Aino Charwat;

S. 695. An act for the relief of William Greville Birkett;

S. 794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shu-Ting Liu Hsia and her daughter, Lucia;

S. 869. An act for the relief of Marie Cafcalaki;

S. 897. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thanos Mellos, Michel Mellos, and Hermine Fahnl;

S. 992. An act for the relief of Daniel Wolkonsky and his wife, Xenia Wolkonsky;

S. 1189. An act for the relief of Anthony Lombardo;

S. 1192. An act for the relief of Demetrius Alexander Jordan;

S. 1420. An act for the relief of Pinfang Hsia;

S. 1494. An act for the relief of George Georgacopoulos;

S. 1517. An act to amend the Act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement forest timber in amounts not exceeding \$2,000 in appraised value;

S. 1565. An act for the relief of Andy Duzsik;

S. 1765. An act for the relief of Harumi Kamiaka;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of Frederic James Mercado;

S. 1879. An act for the relief of Ernest Nanpei Ibrig;

S. 2033. An act for the relief of Gluseppa S. Boyd;

S. 2034. An act for the relief of Charlotte Elizabeth Cason;

S. 2051. An act for the relief of Naomi Saito;

S. 2145. An act for the relief of certain displaced persons;

S. 2220. An act for the relief of Theresa Hatcher;

S. 2588. An act for the relief of Dulce Ann Steinhart Sherlock; and

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Matheos Alafouzou.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 20, 1952, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4949. An act to amend the act of February 10, 1920, so as to provide for free blank ammunition for veterans' organizations for use in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased veterans, and for other ceremonial purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1453. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1953 (H. Doc. No. 470); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1454. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of \$2,133,012.59, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 471); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1455. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on the activities and transactions of the Administration for the period January 1, 1952, through March 31, 1952, pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1456. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the sixteenth annual report of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1457. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting lists containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1458. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7714. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANFUSO: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7641. A bill to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II; without amendment (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 7241. A bill to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam; with amendment (Rept. No. 1959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1855. An act for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano; without amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1953. An act for the relief of Midori Sugimoto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2039. An act for the relief of Debra Elaine Evans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2462. An act for the relief of Teruo Uechi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2554. An act for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko; without amendment (Rept. No. 1964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2571. An act for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2593. An act for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2643. An act for the relief of Kathleen

Cowley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2768. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Sheppard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2805. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr; without amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1092. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar; with amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Henryk Kramarski; with amendment (Rept. No. 1971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2166. A bill for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco); without amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2661. A bill for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife; with amendment (Rept. No. 1973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3154. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu; with amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 7930. A bill to terminate the manufacturers' excise tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 7931. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Old-Age and Retirement Benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7932. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 7933. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 7934. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 7935. A bill for the relief of the city of Kirkland, Wash.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 so as to abolish the Wage Stabilization Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution to amend sections 1606 and 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 458. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States relative to the taxation and borrowing powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 647. Resolution to amend clause (b) (3) of rule X of the House rules; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HART: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey memorializing the Congress of the United States to return to the State of New Jersey and other States sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the various States for the administration of employment security and to provide adequately for administration of the employment security program in the State of New Jersey and other States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 7936. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7937. A bill for the relief of Inge Sanger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7938. A bill for the relief of Sonia Sookhdeo Wall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7939. A bill for the relief of Tom Kwok Hee, Tom Kwok Jing, Tom Shim Goon, and Tom Lai Goon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 7940. A bill for the relief of Theresia Hotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 7941. A bill for the relief of Masako Kato and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7942. A bill for the relief of Evangelos J. Demetriades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7943. A bill for the relief of Jean Rudiano (also known as Ivan Rudenko); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7944. A bill for the relief of Kerupe Herant Liman, Mrs. Violet Liman and Hilda Annik Liman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7945. A bill for the relief of Mie Kuniyoshi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 7946. A bill for the relief of Maurice Ghnassa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

739. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the mayor of Cidra, P. R., requesting that the Congress of the United States approve the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the

Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the first calendar quarter of 1952.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data. Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19-----

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th

(Mark one square only)

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" in answer to Item "B."

(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—Reports by Agents or Employees. An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) if a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as employers—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.
2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the specific legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.
3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) In General. The term "contribution" includes *anything of value*. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) In General.** Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) **Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.—**A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) **Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.—**Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of \$500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) In General.** In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) **Employer as Contributor of \$500 or More.—**When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to \$500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution, under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOAN.):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. \$-----Dues and assessments
2. \$-----Gifts of money or anything of value.
3. \$-----Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. \$-----Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. \$-----Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. \$-----TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. \$-----Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. \$-----TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

- "The term 'contribution' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).
9. \$-----TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
 10. \$-----Borrowed from others during this Quarter
 11. \$-----Repaid to others during this Quarter
 12. \$-----"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of \$500 or more

(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": -----

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter, total \$500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	Name and Address of Contributor
	("Period" from Jan. 1 through -----, 19-----)
\$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
\$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
\$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) In General. "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered items is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. \$-----Public relations and advertising services
2. \$-----Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. \$-----Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. \$-----Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. \$-----Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. \$-----Telephone and telegraph
7. \$-----Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. \$-----All other expenditures
9. \$-----TOTAL for this Quarter (add "1" through "8")
10. \$-----Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. \$-----TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. \$-----TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. \$-----Lent to others during this Quarter
14. \$-----Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of \$10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of, the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	Date or Dates	Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose
\$1,750.00	7-11:	Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshblanks Bill."
\$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15:	Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at \$800.00 per month.
\$4,150.00		TOTAL

A. Active Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, post-office box 2169, South Portland, Maine.

C. (2) To aid in the passage of H. R. 1526, H. R. 1995, and H. R. 2273.

D. (6) \$1,291.
E. (2) \$420.86; (4) \$435.64; (5) \$51.35; (6) \$5; (7) \$179.27; (9) \$1,092.12.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Strategic minerals, including manganese.

E. (4) \$231.23; (6) \$4.35; (7) \$124.05; (8) \$5.25; (9) \$364.88; (11) \$364.88; (15) \$228.63, the Public Printer, Washington, D. C., reprints.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft manufacturing industry. (3) Annual Report of the President for 1951.

D. (6) \$4,705.81.
E. (1) \$4,500; (4) \$205.81; (9) \$4,705.81; (11) \$4,705.81; (15) \$4,500, Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., public relations counsel; \$89.45, The Judges, Inc., Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., writing letters; \$33.61, Lithographic Photo Services, Inc., 1713 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C., plates for printing annual report; \$82.75, George A. Simonds & Co., 1250 Taylor Street, Washington, D. C., fold, stitch, and trim annual reports.

A. Roy G. Allman, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Until section 8 of the War Claims Act of 1948 is passed and an equitable treaty to Americans with Japan is passed.

E. (5) \$30; (6) \$20; (7) \$50; (9) \$100.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) \$4,374.99; (7) \$656.56; (9) \$5,031.55.

A. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Edificio Bearn, Plaza Santos Degollado, Mexico, D. F.

C. (2) I. R. C. section 116 (a), to exempt from United States income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

A. American Coalition, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) American Coalition is a patriotic, nonprofit organization representing organizations of like character, the purpose of which is to promote patriotism and a better understanding of the American form of government and to preserve it against attack.

D. (6) \$3,052.27.
E. (2) \$750; (4) \$96.70; (5) \$893.08; (6) \$103.49; (9) \$1,843.27.

A. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation involving the practice of medicine and all national health insurance legislation.

D. (6) \$62,270.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price and production controls.

D. (6) \$3,985.82.
E. (2) \$3,187.08; (5) \$232.70; (6) \$107.26; (7) \$458.78; (9) \$3,985.82; (11) \$3,985.82; (15) \$1,524.30, Robert C. Jackson, 416 Argyle Drive, Alexandria, Va., salary and expenses;

\$805.67, C. G. Caffrey, 215 South Royal Street, Alexandria, Va., salary and expenses; \$524.35, C. T. Murchison, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; \$93, Irma J. Irwin, 2120 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; etc.¹

A. American Dental Association, 22 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) To protect and further the interests of the public and the dental profession in matters of patents, legislation, and regulations, and to disseminate information which will assist the constituent and component societies in their problems involving the enactment and enforcement of legislation involving the dental health of the public or the practice of dentistry.

D. (6) \$7,493.13.
E. (2) \$6,278.88; (5) \$52.71; (6) \$144; (7) \$1,017.55; (9) \$7,493.13; (11) \$7,493.13; (15) \$2,425.90, Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; \$1,316.34, B. J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; \$1,041, O. O. Norberg, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; \$741, H. Hofener, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; \$75, E. Harold Gale, 142 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y., reimbursement of expenditures for secretarial services; etc.¹

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; and 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests cover primarily the fields of legislation affecting agriculture. (3) Nation's Agriculture and News Letter.

D. (6) \$49,634.
E. (2) \$13,624; (4) \$3,449; (5) \$1,809; (6) \$1,654; (7) \$574; (9) \$21,110; (11) \$21,110; (15) \$1,133.84, Franklin Duplicating Service, Washington, D. C., mimeographing; \$185.50, Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner expenses; \$970.66, Kable Printing Co., Mount Morris, Ill., printing; \$1,313.33, Mercury Press, Inc., Washington, D. C., printing.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the interest of working people. (3) American Federationist.

E. (1) \$7,159.92; (2) \$13,314.98; (4) \$3,697.94; (5) \$1,025; (9) \$25,197.84; (11) \$25,197.84; (15) \$7,159.92, Furman Feiner & Co., 117 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., radio; \$3,697.94, Ransdell, Inc., 805 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., printing; \$2,754, W. C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary; \$2,364, W. J. Mason, 311 Holly Avenue, Takoma Park, Md., salary; \$2,364, G. D. Biley, 2100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary; etc.¹

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Oppose S. 1202; for S. 1318, H. R. 3599, H. R. 3580, H. R. 3581, H. R. 3640, H. R. 3747, H. R. 3762, H. R. 3769, H. R. 3805, H. R. 3809, H. R. 3836, H. R. 3848, H. R. 3902, H. R. 4912, H. R. 4748, H. R. 4051, S. 2652, S. 1874.

D. (6) \$7,462.08.
E. (2) \$1,000; (4) \$50; (5) \$150; (6) \$35; (7) \$125; (9) \$1,360.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ability of hospitals to render good care or which may affect hospital care for the American people.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) \$12,677.66.

E. (2) \$7,493.75; (4) \$866.23; (5) \$940.14; (6) \$305.21; (7) \$374.62; (8) \$747.71; (9) \$10,727.66; (11) \$10,727.66.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the industry.

D. (6) \$19,549.59.
E. (2) \$9,218.84; (9) \$12,868.43; (15) \$3,750, M. O. Ryan, Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., salary; \$1,875, Charles R. Rich-ey, Washington, D. C., salary; \$2,250, Edward A. McCabe, Washington, D. C., salary.

A. The American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II, and their dependents, on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, re-education, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities, with particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws, child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agriculture development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies, and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services, etc. (3) American Legion magazine, Legislative Bulletin, and Merchant Marine Bulletin.

D. (6) \$51,230.59.
E. (1) \$3,208.15; (2) \$12,713.76; (4) \$10,222.90; (5) \$1,920.87; (6) \$41.81; (7) \$3,377.49; (9) \$31,884.98; (11) \$31,884.98; (15)¹

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect the life-insurance business.

D. (6) \$3,845.38.
E. (2) \$2,824; (5) \$436.11; (6) \$40.11; (7) \$545.16; (9) \$3,845.38; (11) \$3,845.38.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) The general legislative interest of the American Medical Association is to advance the science and art of medicine.¹

D. (6) \$225,000.
E. (1) \$50,000; (2) \$28,933.49; (5) \$5,101.25; (6) \$841.47; (7) \$946.78; (8) \$10,456.21; (9) \$96,279.20; (11) \$96,279.20; (15) \$50,000, Whitaker & Baxter, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., public relations; \$883.33, H. L. Rust & Co., 1001 Fifteenth Street SW., Washington, D. C., rent; \$75, Press Association, Inc., 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y., telephone and telegraph; \$5,000, J. S. Lawrence, M. D., A. M. A., Washington office, postage, etc.¹

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Proposed legislation supported or opposed: Price controls, slaughter quotas, hide exports, transportation legislation, meat-inspection appropriation, foot-and-mouth disease, land legislation, etc. (3) American Cattle Producer.

D. (6) \$20,510.36.
E. (2) \$6,750; (6) \$151.24; (7) \$1,693.27; (8) \$202.64; (9) \$8,797.15; (11) \$8,797.15.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio.

C. (2) In addition to the bills listed in the previous report, all of which have some relation direct or indirect to the practice of the profession of optometry: S. 2325, S. 2552, S. 2714, S. 2738; H. R. 7320, H. R. 6319, H. R. 6921, H. R. 6720.

E. (2) \$3,175; (5) \$31.71; (6) \$113.54; (7) \$27.44; (9) \$3,347.69; (11) \$3,347.69.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Bills affecting the public health, such as H. R. 910 and S. 2301, Nurses Education Aid; S. 1245 and S. 2337, Emergency Maternity and Infant Care; S. 1140, Federal Department of Health; S. 1, Universal Military Training.

D. (6) \$541.93.
E. (4) \$89.14; (6) \$8.79; (9) \$541.93; (11) \$541.93.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operations, practices and properties.

D. (6) \$295.
E. (2) \$250; (6) \$25; (7) \$20; (9) \$295; (11) \$295.

A. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Ave., New York, N. Y.

C. (2) National school health services bill, public-school construction bill, national child research bill, Federal aid for medical education, local public health units, physically handicapped children's education bill, school-lunch appropriation, Children's Bureau appropriation, cabinet status for the Federal Security Agency, Federal aid to day-care centers in defense areas, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, emergency maternal and infant care, defense housing and community facilities.

D. (6) \$5,903.62.
E. (2) \$1,155.18; (4) \$37.14; (5) \$541.84; (6) \$52.09; (8) \$336; (9) \$2,122.25.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

D. (6) \$32,675.
E. (2) \$5,625; (5) \$3,400; (6) \$258; (7) \$1,435; (9) \$10,718; (11) \$10,718; (15) \$3,387.42, J. E. Kane, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; \$3,672.65, J. L. Dwyer, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; \$258, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone calls.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests include all measures affecting the pulpwood industry, its practices or properties.

A. American Pyrotechnics Association, 6711 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) Pending and proposed legislation affecting the pyrotechnics industry including, but not limited to the following bills: H. R. 4528, H. R. 4675, H. R. 6722.

D. (6) \$5,500.
E. (2) \$3,125; (6) \$97.96; (7) \$177.25; (9) \$3,400.21; (11) \$3,400.21.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Gov-

ernment, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.¹

D. (6) \$42,010.03.
E. (2) \$8,750; (4) \$150.77; (5) \$785.83; (6) \$430.15; (7) \$316.26; (9) \$10,433.01; (11) \$10,433.01.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,869.30.
E. (2) \$250; (4) \$345.27; (5) \$418.27; (6) \$52.30; (7) \$803.46; (9) \$1,869.30; (11) \$1,869.30; (15).¹

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 5505, H. R. 6843, S. 2791.

D. (6) \$16,750.
E. (2) \$8,706; (4) \$1,410.47; (5) \$2,986.31; (6) \$162.94; (7) \$441.11; (8) \$808.82; (9) \$14,515.65; (11) \$14,515.65; (15) \$875.24, Chas. F. Noyes Co., 40 Wall Street, New York City, N. Y., rent and electricity; \$46.47, Graham Stationery Co., 26 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, stationery and supplies; \$80.19, Aetna Printing Co., 64 Reade Street, New York City, stationery; \$158.37, New York Telephone Co., P. O. Box O., New York City, telephone service; \$52, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., news service; etc.¹

A. American Textile Machinery Association (formerly National Association of Textile Machinery Manufacturers), Whitinsville, Mass.

C. (2) The general legislative interests of the association consist of matters affecting the textile machinery industry. The specific legislative interest of the association during the period covered by this report was H. R. 1012, relating to the duty-free importation into the United States of textile machinery destined for textile schools.

E. (2) \$255.69; (9) \$255.69; (11) \$255.69; (15) \$255.69, Herrick, Smith, Donald, Farley & Ketchum, 1 Federal Street, Boston 10, Mass., fees and expenses.

A. AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Concerned with veterans' legislation, UMT, Reserve legislation, general welfare and Americanism programs. (3) National AMVET.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 4059, copyright amendment bill, relating to the manufacturing clause; Senate Resolution 253, calling on Tariff Commission to make section 336 investigation on pottery; H. R. 3711, photoengraving; temporary free importation of samples under bond; Senate Joint Resolution 122, bill on executive agreements.

D. (6) \$4,142.72.
E. (1) \$4,110.76; (5) \$40.28; (6) \$47.50; (7) \$57.07; (8) \$4,255.61; (15).¹

A. Paul A. Amundsen, 919 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Association of Port Authorities, 919 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation involving submerged lands, shipping, Panama Canal tolls, foreign trade zones, river and harbor developments, etc.

D. (6) \$1,149.99.

A. Angelina & Neches River R. R. Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.

C. (2) General legislation affecting Texas railroads.¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) \$4,374.99; (8) \$1,214.74; (9) \$5,589.73.

A. Richard H. Anthony, 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

B. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 5505, H. R. 6843, S. 2791.

D. (6) \$3,125.
E. (7) \$68.43; (9) \$68.43.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Tax legislation, labor legislation, amendments to the Clayton Act, merchant marine legislation, price basing point legislation, Defense Production Act, wage stabilization legislation, St. Lawrence waterways.

D. (6) \$1,250.
E. (8) \$950.38; (9) \$950.38.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West Forty-fifth Street, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) \$900; (7) \$33.96; (9) \$933.96.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the construction industry.

E. (9) \$6,500.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.

D. (6) \$1,500.
E. (4) \$1,500; (9) \$1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads,¹ 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Generally to keep informed with respect to legislation affecting transportation; to support such legislation as members of the Association of American Railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy; and to oppose legislation which they believe to be contrary to such interests.¹ (3).¹

D. (6) \$73,931.81.
E. (2) \$42,738.87; (3) \$10,000; (4) \$10,790.33; (5) \$4,520.56; (6) \$395.10; (7) \$636.77; (8) \$4,850.18; (9) \$73,931.81; (15).¹

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies,¹ 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

D. (6) \$1,661.78.
E. (2) \$1,302.85; (4) \$39.87; (5) \$94.53; (6) \$30.69 (7) \$72.99; (8) \$120.85; (9) \$1,661.78.

A. Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which do or may affect the western railroads.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding labor laws and revenue act.

E. (2) \$125; (11) \$125.

A. Atlantic Union Committee, Inc., 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (7) \$27,348.79.

E. (2) \$18,401.06; (4) \$4,565.90; (5) \$1,424.37; (6) \$1,036.31; (7) \$3,902.13; (8) \$955.06; (9) \$30,284.83; (15)¹

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All Federal legislation that might affect electric utilities.¹

D. (6) \$6,250.

E. (6) \$9.32; (7) \$58.32; (9) \$77.64.

A. Charles E. Babcock, route 4, box 73, Vienna, Va.

B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3025-3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Restriction of immigration; improvement of free public schools; suppression of communism; any other legislation we consider patriotic to support or object to.

D. (7) \$249.99.

E. (5) \$60; (6) \$7.25; (7) \$35.20; (8) \$16.30; (9) \$118.55.

A. Frazer A. Bailey, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of American Shipbuilding, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 241, H. R. 4729, S. 2432, S. 2487, S. 1142, Senate Joint Resolution 27, H. R. 6947, H. R. 7072, H. R. 7289. (3) The American Merchant Marine.

D. (6) \$3,125.

A. John A. Baker, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).

C. (2) Legislation of interest to the National Farmers Union.

D. (6) \$2,925.

A. Mary Alice Baldinger, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are antilynching, antipoll tax, omnibus civil rights, FEPC, home rule for the District of Columbia, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, immigration legislation.

D. (6) \$400.

E. (5) \$23; (6) \$9.06; (7) \$11.40; (9) \$43.46.

A. H. M. Baldrige, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that refers to sugar generally and the refining of raw cane sugar specifically.

D. (6) \$6,000.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Shipowners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, particularly railroad labor.

D. (6) \$1,860.45.

E. (6) \$175.19; (7) \$224.19; (8) \$514.62; (9) \$914.

A. Fowler W. Barker, 17 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of Professional Photogrammetrists, 17 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To get invoked section 251, paragraph 9 of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, for photogrammetric map-making contractors to Government.

D. (6) \$5,000.

E. (2) \$50; (9) \$50.

A. James T. Barnes, 203 Capital Club Building, Raleigh, N. C.

B. Medical Society of the State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N. C.

C. (2) H. R. 14, 87, 149, 274, 348, 417, 483, 913, 910, 1140, 1272, 1368, 1502, 1545, 1644, 1752, 1781, 3298, 3456, 4079, 4212, 4371, 4373, 4405, 4473, 4519, 4549, 4569, 4577, 4579, 4605, 4723, 4912, 5414, 5426, 5718, 5853; H. Res. 38; S. 1, 101, 337, 349, 351, 445, 1186, 1328, 2171, 2246, 2247, 2248, 1140, 1714, 1848, 1875, 2301, 2325, 2337.

E. (2) \$2,100; (8) \$2,100.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that might affect electric utility companies.¹

D. (6) \$4,562.50.

E. (6) \$3.41; (7) \$138.24; (8) \$23.20; (9) \$164.85.

A. Irvin Barney, Jr., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and all legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.

D. (6) \$1,900.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills affecting proprietary medicines industry.

E. (7) \$100; (9) \$100.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians.¹

E. (2) \$5,805; (3) \$16; (4) \$144.36; (5) \$5; (11) \$5,970.36.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, identical bills to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Wendell Berge, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting third-class postal rates.

D. (6) \$1,500.

E. (8) \$8; (9) \$8; (11) \$8; (12) \$500; (14) \$2,158.17.

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.¹

D. (6) \$1,000.

E. (7) \$6.50; (9) \$6.50; (11) \$6.50.

A. Joe Betts, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; Federal Food and Drug Act amendment; repeal of resale price maintenance; antitrust legislation; education, immigration legislation; Mexican farm labor importation; method for computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; Sugar Act extension; Marketing Facilities Act; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; mutual-security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; amendment of BIR code relating to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; postal rates; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; tobacco; peanut oil provisions of agricultural legislation; IOC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; National Farmers Day; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriation; appropriation Agricultural Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; family farm policy review; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service, universal military training; fair trade pricing study; United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty nations; farm credit legislation; appropriations for defense.

D. (6) \$303.75.

E. (7) \$126.59; (9) \$126.59; (11) \$126.59.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters; the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States; American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange; American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.

C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks; reparations; subrogation.

E. (6) \$9.42; (7) \$36.06; (9) \$45.48; (11) \$45.48.

A. Norman E. Biorn, 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Federal and State taxation and governmental expenditures.

D. (6) \$155.
E. (2) \$150; (5) \$4.25; (9) \$154.25; (11) \$154.25.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) \$600.
E. (7) \$500; (9) \$500; (11) \$500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) \$416.67.
E. (7) \$218.96; (9) \$218.96; (11) \$218.96.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.

D. (6) \$2,892.93.
E. (2) \$1,999.98; (6) \$17.19; (7) \$75.76; (9) \$2,892.93.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks.

A. C. A. Bodary, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislative matters of interest to railway employees and labor in general.

D. (6) \$2,275.

A. Morton Bodfish, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

D. (6) \$625.

A. John N. Bohannon, 75 Macon Avenue, Asheville, N. C., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting business in general, and particularly any advocated changes in public policy concerning fuels—coal, oil, and natural gas; or, any legislative action which might affect supply, production, gathering, transportation, sales or distribution of natural gas and the demand therefor by consumers.

D. (6) \$4,500.
E. (5) \$477.54; (6) \$207.91; (7) \$1,271.81; (9) \$1,957.26; (11) \$1,957.26.

A. Daniel L. Boland, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that more or less specifically affects the paint, varnish, and lacquer industry.¹

E. (7) \$15.50; (9) \$15.50.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington D. C.

B. American Jewish Congress, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York N. Y.

C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.

D. (6) \$125.
E. (6) \$4.14; (7) \$10.50; (9) \$14.64; (11) \$14.64.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting industry, including appropriations, tax policies, subsidies, controls over industry, etc.

D. (6) \$1000.
E. (9) \$191.28.

A. R. B. Bowden, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington D. C. or 100 Merchants Exchange St. Louis, Mo.

B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange St. Louis Mo.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.

D. (6) \$4,500.
E. (7) \$1,203.15; (9) \$1,203.15.

A. H. B. Boyd, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948, and related legislation.

D. (6) \$4,500.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. D. H. Brackett, Post Office Box 622, Atlanta, Ga.

C. (2) Legislation to require responsibility of city policemen and other petty arresting officers by being bonded or prohibited from carrying lethal weapons.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc. (3) The Brewery Worker.

D. (6) \$167.50.
E. (9) \$167.50; (11) \$167.50.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting transportation matters in which members of the association are interested, particularly S. 2351, S. 2352, S. 2355, S. 2358, S. 2361, and S. 2362.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting industry, including labor and tax policies, expenditures and subsidies, industrial mobilization, Government controls over industry, Government competition with private enterprise, etc.

D. (6) \$3,375.
E. (9) \$1,733.17.

A. O. O. Bright, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the lumber-manufacturing industry.

D. (6) \$1,320.
E. (7) \$43.73; (9) \$43.73; (11) \$43.73.

A. M. H. Brightman, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. H. E. Brinckerhoff, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. Dawes E. Brisbane, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation pending before the Congress dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification, or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation related specifically to food processing and farming.

D. (6) \$1,200.
E. (6) \$150; (7) \$370; (9) \$520; (11) \$520.

A. A. E. Brooks, 408 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.

B. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Edificio Bearn, Plaza Santos Degollado, Mexico, D. F.

C. (2) Internal Revenue Code, section 116 (a), to exempt from United States income taxes income derived from sources

abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

A. William F. Brooks, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

D. (6) \$5,642.01.

A. C. R. Brown, 10 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.

D. (6) \$1,070.82.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.¹

D. (6) \$7,500.

E. (2) \$5,825; (5) \$375; (8) \$42.50; (9) \$7,242.50; (11) \$7,242.50; (15).¹

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Postal legislation.

D. (6) \$712.93.

E. (6) \$6.20; (7) \$662.29; (9) \$668.49; (11) \$668.49.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

E. (9) \$10.15.

A. Jack Bryson, 1600 I Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the motion-picture industry when introduced in Congress.

D. (6) \$6,280.79.

E. (7) \$1,363.52; (8) \$583.50; (9) \$1,947.02; (11) \$1,947.02; (15).¹

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) \$1,350.

E. (6) \$12.29; (8) \$41.31; (9) \$53.60; (11) \$53.60.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Corporate income and excess-profits taxes.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George Bugbee, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,562.50.

E. (7) \$200.50; (9) \$200.50; (11) \$200.50.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., and 714 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 714 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in rubber tires bill, basing point legislation, antitrust law legislation, spare tire monopoly and all legislation affecting independent small business.

D. (6) \$2,659.98.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 Eighteenth Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation that might affect member electric utility companies.¹

D. (6) \$1,166.68.

E. (7) \$222.31; (8) \$23.75; (9) \$246.06; (11) \$246.03.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Assn., 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$5,199.

E. (2) \$6,032.46; (5) 303.71; (6) \$39.42; (7) \$222.13; (9) \$6,597.72; (11) \$6,597.72.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street S.E., Washington, D. C.

B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 5653 College Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation for the relief of the Burnham Chemical Co.

D. (6) \$2,874.18.

E. (2) \$1,360.40; (4) \$383.81; (5) \$365.09; (6) \$22.44; (7) \$731.54; (8) \$10.90; (9) \$2,874.18; (11) \$2,874.18; (15).¹

A. Robert M. Burr, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation affecting imports of products into the United States.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 Fifteenth Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 Fifteenth Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as attempts made by Congress to reduce annual and sick leave for Federal employees, and to support unemployment insurance coverage and other more liberal benefits for the workers.

D. (6) \$2,067.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington, D. C.

B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

D. (6) \$2,475.

E. (7) \$42.80; (9) \$42.80; (11) \$42.80.

A. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

B. U. S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation, etc., for higher tariffs and import quotas for screws, nuts, rivets, and similar fasteners.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation, etc., for higher tariffs and import quotas for screws, nuts, rivets, and similar fasteners.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

C. (2) H. R. 1724, renegotiation of contracts (Public Law 9, 82d Cong.); H. R. 5505, customs simplification, to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930; H. R. 4473 (Public Law 83, 82d Cong.), Revenue Act of 1951; H. R. 1612 (Public Law 50, 82d Cong.); Trade Agreements Act of 1951; Public Law 773, Eighty-first Congress; Public Law 96, Eighty-second Congress; Defense Production Act of 1950; amendments to Defense Production Act of 1951; S. 2645, to amend and extend Defense Production Act of 1950; S. 2557, awarding military contracts, distressed areas; S. 2504, Defense Unemployment Compensation Act of 1952; H. Res. 582, Allen resolution.

D. (6) \$760.20.

E. (6) \$3; (7) \$12.47; (8) \$30; (9) \$45.47; (11) \$45.47.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, together with the firm of Harter and Calhoun, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Avon Products, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y., and Beauty Counselors, Inc., 17108 Mack Avenue, Grosse Pointe, Mich.

C. (2) Excise tax on cosmetics, H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951.

D. (6) \$6,000.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Cordage Institute, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 1005.

D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Internal revenue measures.

D. (6) \$1,200.

A. R. B. Carothers, Paris, Tenn.

B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Inc., Paris, Tenn.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., Kentucky Clay Mining, Mayfield, Ky.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.

C. (2) Retaining percentage depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays, allowed by section 114, Internal Revenue Code, title 26.

E. (6) \$32.70; (7) \$329.88; (8) \$50; (9) \$412.58; (11) \$412.58.

A. T. C. Carroll, President, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) At present working for passage of H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

A. Henderson H. Carson, George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C., and 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.

B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to natural gas industry.

D. (6) \$3,198.80.
E. (1) \$30; (2) \$55; (3) \$25; (4) \$9; (5) \$9.60; (6) \$42.80; (7) \$16.20; (8) \$11.20; (9) \$198.80.

A. Joseph K. Carson, Jr., Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

B. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

D. (6) \$3,000.
E. (5) \$634.86; (6) \$99.92; (7) \$394.29; (9) \$1,129.07.

A. Clarence B. Carter, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn.

B. Railroad Pension Conference, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn.

C. (2) For enactment of H. R. 63 and S. 1308, 30-year, half-pay retirement; for enactment of H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, amended to be payable from first day of illness.

E. (7) \$48.60; (9) \$48.60.

A. D. E. Casey, 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lawrence J. Casey, Jr., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) \$1,109.50.
E. (7) \$33.90; (8) \$13.10; (9) \$47.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Statutes or bills which affect the interests of milk dealers.

D. (6) \$200.
E. (7) \$3.50; (9) \$3.50.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

C. (2) S. 75, Bridge Canyon Act, H. R. 1500 and H. R. 1501, Bridge Canyon Act known more frequently as central Arizona project bill; (3)¹

D. (6) \$5,326.
E. (1) \$116.43; (2) \$7,869.23; (3) \$250; (4) \$957.76; (5) \$1,373.96; (6) \$193.48; (7) \$1,058.88; (8) \$74.76; (9) \$11,894.50; (15)¹

A. William E. Chace, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, in the Eighty-second Congress such as S. 1693, and H. R. 1755.

D. (6) \$70.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to business.¹ (3) Legislative Daily and Legislative Outlook.

D. (6) \$994,134.15.
E. (9) \$30,406.48.¹

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting industry, labor, and tax policies, expenditures and subsidies, remobilization of industry, controls over industry, Government competition with private enterprise, etc.

D. (6) \$10,246.99.
E. (9) \$2,246.99.

A. Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.

C. (2) Promoting Senate Joint Resolution 29 and House Joint Resolution 156, a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.

D. (6) \$3,913.32.

E. (1) \$1,115.84; (2) \$1,702.45; (4) \$668.38; (5) \$150.33; (6) \$8.46; (7) \$75.60; (9) \$3,721.06; (15) \$527.30, Floyd Burre Printing Service, Harrison Street, Topeka, Kans., printing; \$10.50, Arrow Engraving Co., North Kansas Avenue, Topeka, Kans., cuts; \$75, Mrs. T. B. Boyle, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans., rent; \$11.22, Crane & Co., East Eighth Street, Topeka, Kans., office supplies; \$16.21, Capper Engraving Co., West Eighth Street, Topeka, Kans., cuts; etc.¹

A. Elisabeth Christman, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

A. Citizens' Committee on Foreign Policy, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Foreign policy.

A. David R. Clarke, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting industry in general.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company, including but not limited to the following bills: Railroad safety, H. R. 269; rail-

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

road switching service, S. 446; mail contract investigation, Senate Resolution 23; basing point, S. 719; transportation investigation, Senate Resolution 55; St. Lawrence waterway legislation; various bills to amend Railroad Retirement Act; various general and corporate tax bills; legislation to amend Reorganization Act of 1949; boxcar and railroad equipment shortage, S. 1918 and Senate Resolution 89; United States Code amendment, H. R. 270; all transportation bills pending before Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under Senate Resolution 50.

D. (6) \$4,400.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Oppose any proposed legislation, such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, Eighty-first Congress, calling for the duplication of class I-A clear-channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I-A standard broadcast stations; opposes ratification of the so-called NA RBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.

E. (3) \$71.25; (7) \$607.36; (9) \$678.61.

A. Herman Clott, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Suite 412, Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Support all legislation in the interest of membership of organization and for the advancement of interest of membership; national bills favoring economic betterment of membership, wage and price legislation, and legislation dealing with civil rights and democracy.

D. (6) \$1,287.

A. W. Frank Clucas, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Master Plumbers, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and piping industries. (3) Plumbing and heating business.

E. (2) \$700; (8) \$2,000; (9) \$2,700.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, 24 Mallow Hill Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

B. Active—Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.

C. (2) To aid in the passage of H. R. 1526, H. R. 1995, and H. R. 2273.

D. (7) \$120.
E. (6) \$2.20; (7) \$34.01; (8) \$2.34; (9) \$38.55; (11) \$38.55.

A. Marcus Cohn, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Genocide, President's Civil Rights program, etc.

E. (2) \$93.75; (5) \$69.05; (6) \$9.10; (7) \$2.09; (9) \$173.99.

A. C. Fred Coleman, Lewisville, Ark.

B. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Lewisville, Ark.

C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639.

D. (6) \$202.28.
E. (7) \$675.75; (9) \$675.75.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacturer or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, and bills in the Eighty-second Congress such as S. 1693 and H. R. 1755.
D. (6) \$100.

A. Marvin J. Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under the American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The Committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.

D. (7) \$10,000.

E. (5) \$2; (6) \$16.82; (7) \$31.25; (9) \$50.07.

A. Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) General legislative interests of the group is the taxing of competitive business on the same basis without regard to exemptions under section 101 of the present Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) \$170.

E. (1) \$300; \$28.75; (8) \$30; (9) \$358.75; (15) \$300, Marion Strain, 1440 Welton Street, Denver, Colo., general public relations assistance; \$28.75, Edna P. Hubbard, Symes Building, Denver, Colo., stenographic services; \$15, Postmaster, Denver, Colo., postage stamps; \$15, William P. Helm, Washington, D. C., subscription.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) All legislation both general and special that affects the Colorado railroads.¹

E. (2) \$280; (7) \$242; (9) \$522.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Opposing S. 75 and H. R. 1500, favoring passage of S. J. Res. 26 and H. J. Res. 21.

E. (1) \$1,807.27; (2) \$10,735; (4) \$4,995.32; (5) \$3,094.97; (6) \$1,036.54; (7) \$3,404.74; (9) \$25,073.84; (15) \$84.88, Advertising Designers, 1240 South Main Street, Los Angeles, art work; \$59.07, Aldine Co., 232 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, office supplies; \$51.68, Allen's Press Clipping Bureau, 124 West Fourth Street, Los Angeles, clipping service; \$1,842.82, Anderson & Ritchie, 1932 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, printing; \$60.81, T. G. Armstrong, 548 Spreckels Building, San Diego, luncheon expenses; etc.¹

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

E. (9) \$727.95.

A. John C. Cone, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Supporting or opposing any aviation legislation that might have a bearing on the operation of Pan American World Airways, Inc.

A. Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Inc., 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Supporting all bills giving effect to Hoover Commission reports; opposed to S.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

2325 and S. 2714; opposed to provision for loan powers in SDPA extension.

D. (6) \$22,695.04.

E. (1) \$6,680; (2) \$6,372.92; (4) \$1,458.20; (5) \$1,928.13; (6) \$213.23; (7) \$345; (8) \$250.01; (9) \$1,274.48.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, property, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives; (3) Legis-letter.

D. (6) \$8,195.13.

E. (2) \$1,875; (3) \$4,000; (4) \$617.95; (5) \$405; (6) \$950; (8) \$347.18; (9) \$8,195.13; (15) \$975, Marguerite Nadonley, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., salary; \$900, Patricia Shilby, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., salary; \$4,000, CIO Housing Committee, 723 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., contribution; \$67.95, Cornelius Printing Co., 912 Burlington Avenue, Silver Spring, Md., printing and distribution costs; \$48.96, Congressional Quarterly, 723 Seventeenth Street NW, Washington, D. C., subscription, etc.¹

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) \$2,500.

E. (6) \$52.40; (7) \$23.20; (9) \$75.60.

A. The Consumers' Lobby, 826 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation directly affecting the consumer interest such as price-control provisions in the Defense Production Act (for); fair trade (against); and S. R. 169 (for).

D. (6) \$269.

E. (4) \$333.05; (5) \$230.76; (6) \$27.14; (8) \$47.80; (9) \$638.75; (15) \$72.50, Weiss Printing House, 1202 North Fifth Street, Philadelphia 22, Pa., printing; \$195, J. B. Willis, 826 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C., rent; \$15, Selma Berns, 112 Mineola Boulevard, Mineola, N. Y., mimeographing; \$30.60, Congressional Quarterly News Features, 1156 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., subscription; \$136, Fontana Lithographers, 811 North Capitol Street, Washington 2, D. C., advertising brochure, etc.¹

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.

D. (6) \$1,800.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Lime Association, 927 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and particularly those affecting the lime industry.

D. (6) \$4,000.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C.

B. William A. Sutherland, First National Bank Building, Atlanta, Ga.

C. (2) H. R. 3168.

D. (6) \$500.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation which will raise health standards in the United States, particularly by the process of voluntary action on the part of citizens; particularly concerned with the development of public health services, the passage of legislation to help to bring about more adequate training and professional personnel in the medical profession such as legislation for Federal aid to medical schools and colleges.

D. (6) \$300.

E. (2) \$194; (5) \$9; (6) \$14; (9) \$217.

A. Committee on National Affairs, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$103.

E. (3) \$100; (4) \$12.36; (5) \$38.63; (8) \$259.65; (9) \$410.64; (15) \$100, Benjamin A. Javits, treasurer, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City, for Jacob K. Javits campaign deficit; \$100, Friends of Democracy, Inc. 137 East Fifty-seventh Street, New York City, research work; \$38.63, Abco Press, Inc., 121 East Twenty-fourth Street, New York City, letterheads; \$12.36, New Era Lithograph Co., Inc., 495 Broadway, New York City, photo offsets; \$159.65, New Era Letter Co., 495 Broadway, New York City, lettershop work.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) President Truman's National Health Plan as embodied in H. R. 27, and H. R. 54; also interested in the following measures: S. 337, S. 445, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 913, H. R. 14, H. R. 342, H. R. 146. (3)¹

D. (6) \$7,768.15.

E. (2) \$7,113.62; (4) \$1,958.56; (5) \$1,414.83; (6) \$262.85; (7) \$332.46; (8) \$105.72; (9) \$11,188.04; (15)¹

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Box 1107, Shreveport, La.

C. (2) Legislation affecting petroleum pipelines; S. 1869, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended and for other purposes, and H. R. 5632, a bill to require interstate oil pipelines to procure certificates of public convenience and necessity before construction of new or extension of existing lines.

D. (6) \$69,914.

E. (2) \$4,297.70; (5) \$4,751.06; (6) \$206.33; (7) \$265.14; (8) \$1,652.76; (9) \$11,172.99.

A. Committee on the Present Danger, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The Mutual Security Act of 1951 amendment, etc.

D. (6) \$250.

E. (2) \$1,346.77; (5) \$1,008.04; (6) \$196.47; (7) \$46.17; (8) \$261.24; (9) \$2,858.69; (15)¹

A. Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.

E. (1) \$11,250; (11) \$11,250; (15) \$10,000, Ingoldsby, Coles & Wright, Washington Building, Washington, D. C., legal representation; \$1,250, Seth Levine, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., consultant.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union. (3) CWA News and the CWA Newsletter.
D. (6) \$1,160,651.15.
E. (2) \$3,774.96; (4) \$125.17; (6) \$20.91; (7) \$1,287.11; (9) \$5,208.15.
- A. John T. Corbett, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.
D. (6) \$3,295.56.
E. (5) \$351.21; (6) \$29.06; (7) \$24.56; (9) \$404.33.
- A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$1,350.
E. (2) \$1,200; (9) \$1,200; (15) \$1,200, Harter & Calhoun, Fifteenth and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., fee for services rendered.
- A. J. G. Corona, suite 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company in addition to my administrative duties at the company's capital offices.
E. (7) \$81.50; (9) \$81.50.
- A. Harold B. Corwin, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) \$1,200.
- A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, care of Charles T. Rice, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which may help to effectuate the unification of all Ireland.
D. (7) \$864.24.
E. (1) \$114.24; (9) \$114.24.
- A. Council for Clarification of Pricing Practices, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Good faith competition; S. 719 and H. R. 2820.
D. (6) \$1,125.
- A. Nathan E. Cowan, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) \$2,785.
E. (7) \$910; (9) \$910.
- A. W. W. Coxe, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk and Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
- A. Charles J. Crampton, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.
B. State Tax Association, P. O. Box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) A continuous study of State and Federal tax legislation and administrative rulings and court decisions in tax matters affecting community property taxpayers inequitably.
D. (6) \$231.25.
E. (7) \$231.25; (9) \$231.25.
- A. M. F. Crass, Jr., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the chemical industry.
D. (6) \$244.50.
- A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) \$46,646.21.
E. (2) \$408.33; (7) \$13.75; (9) \$422.08.
- A. Leo J. Crowley, 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) All legislation both general and special that affects the Colorado railroads.¹
- A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Refractories Co., 1520 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; A. P. Green Fire Brick Co., Mexico, Mo.; Harbison-Walker Refractories Co., Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; North American Refractories Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation involving percentage depletion allowances.
- A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Margery Durant Green, 1 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.
C. (2) To extend to the estates of living incompetents the benefits of the Technical Changes Act of 1949.
- A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of W. D. Johnson, deceased, 900 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Amendment of section 1000 (e) of Internal Revenue Code to permit an executor or administrator to release the powers of disposition where the decedent was under a disability during his lifetime.
E. (6) \$21.06; (7) \$7.25; (9) \$28.31.
- A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation and proceedings relating to postal rates.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. John C. Cuneo, Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679, the Townsend plan bills.
D. (6) \$1,356.52.
E. (5) \$544.30; (6) \$164.55; (7) \$144.27; (8) \$241.98; (9) \$1,095.10.
- A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
- C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (6) \$2,100.
E. (4) \$15.41; (6) \$24.56; (7) \$33.10; (8) \$1.02; (9) \$74.09.
- A. William L. Daley, 911 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 1, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 3760, H. R. 2682, H. R. 505, H. R. 2516, S. 1137, S. 719, H. R. 3341, H. R. 5575, S. 436, H. R. 5379, H. Res. 423, H. R. 5056, H. R. 4745, H. R. 5204, H. R. 4741, S. 2170, S. 2645, H. R. 6546, H. R. 5308, S. 658, H. R. 6600, H. R. 6250, H. R. 6239, S. 2504, H. R. 6174, H. R. 7315, H. R. 7326, H. R. 2188, H. R. 1514, S. 672, H. Res. 116, S. 106, H. R. 1768, H. R. 116, H. R. 525, H. R. 7151, H. R. 7072, H. R. 7391, H. R. 7314, H. R. 7289, H. R. 6892, H. R. 7030, H. R. 7434, H. R. 6925, H. R. 7153, H. Res. 561, H. Res. 520, S. 2957, S. 2198, S. 2945, H. R. 7339. (3) The National Publisher.
D. (6) \$825.
E. (5) \$44.05; (6) \$56.69; (7) \$100; (8) \$72.10; (9) \$272.84; (15)¹
- A. William V. Dameron, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
- A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 227 and similar legislation dealing with distribution of motor vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail.
D. (6) \$1,875.
- A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 277 and similar legislation dealing with distribution of motor-vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail.
D. (6) \$1,875.
- A. Paul J. Daugherty, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Proposals in the fields of taxation, general appropriations, old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation, industrial development and other management problems.
D. (6) \$2,749.98.
E. (7) \$222.36; (9) \$222.36.
- A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the meat-packing industry.
D. (6) \$2,692.34.
E. (6) \$317.87; (7) \$4,251.20; (8) \$81.39; (9) \$4,650.46.
- A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. Homer R. Davison, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting the meat-packing industry.
 D. (6) \$500.
 E. (4) \$5.16; (6) \$9.77; (7) \$352.54; (8) \$62.41; (9) \$429.88.
- A. Robert N. Denham, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Continental Baking Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
 C. (2) Labor relations and general industrial regulatory legislation.
 D. (6) \$2,598.70.
 E. (6) \$37.09; (7) \$61.61; (9) \$98.70.
- A. R. T. DeVany, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$1,200.
 E. (9) \$464.90.
- A. Gordon Dickie, Keshena, Wis.
 B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.
 C. (2) Legislation which will provide for distribution of a portion of the tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to individual members of the tribe and allocate the remainder of the tribal funds for designated purposes indicated by the tribal council; opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and favor enactment of H. J. Res. 8, H. R. 264, and H. R. 2495.
- A. A. W. Dickinson, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
 D. (6) \$1,375.
 E. (6) \$0.20; (7) \$16.50; (9) \$16.70; (11) \$16.70.
- A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) H. R. 3408 and legislation affecting the motion picture industry.
 D. (6) \$3,900.
 E. (7) \$1,300; (9) \$1,300; (11) \$1,300.
- A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
 (3) DAV Semimonthly.
 E. (2) \$5,066.60; (7) \$152.93; (9) \$5,218.93; (10) \$5,218.93; (11) \$5,218.93.
- A. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
 E. (2) \$2,500; (4) \$118.71; (7) \$18.75; (9) \$2,637.46; (11) \$2,637.46; (15) \$98.43, Doyle Printing Service, 1219 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing; \$20.28, Dupli-Kate Service, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., mimeographing.
- A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
 B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.¹
 D. (6) \$1,131.65.
 E. (7) \$68; (9) \$68; (11) \$68.
- A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) General legislative interests include any matters affecting the natural-gas industry.
 D. (6) \$1,250.
- A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla.
 C. (2) Specific legislation employed for was percentage depletion.
 D. (6) \$3,625.
- A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting the sale of distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.
 D. (6) \$556.82.
 E. (2) \$300; (7) \$256.82; (9) \$556.82; (11) \$556.82.
- A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
 D. (6) \$9,562.25.
 E. (2) \$4,712.88; (4) \$150; (5) \$1,332.06; (6) \$203.27; (7) \$954.31; (8) \$1,205.28; (9) \$8,557.80; (11) \$8,557.80; (15).¹
- A. Homer Dodge, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y.
 C. (2) Any proposed legislation or policies involving a constitutional question.
 D. (6) \$870.
- A. William C. Doherty, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
 D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. W. J. Donald, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
 B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and regulation with respect to amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act.
- A. James L. Donnelly, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review.
 D. (6) \$1,250.
 E. (7) \$269.70; (9) \$269.70; (11) \$269.70.
- A. Robert F. Donoghue, 657 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and Transportation Act of 1940; appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
 D. (6) \$900.
- A. Thomas J. Donovan, Tax Council of the Alcoholic Beverage Industries, Inc., 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting excise taxes on alcoholic beverages.
- A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
 B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
 D. (6) \$99.
- A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
 B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
 D. (6) \$1,039.13.
 E. (7) \$35.40; (9) \$35.40; (11) \$35.40.
- A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
 E. (9) \$200.60.
- A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting the interest of the lumber-manufacturing industry.
 D. (6) \$1,750.
 E. (7) \$128; (9) \$128; (11) \$128.
- A. James W. Douthat, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislative programs affecting industry, including labor and tax policies, Federal expenditures and subsidies, Government controls over industry, Government competition with private enterprise, etc.
 D. (6) \$4,704.65.
 E. (9) \$954.65.
- A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.
 B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
 C. (2) Interior appropriation bill (H. R. 7176), amendments to 1939 Reclamation Project Act, central Arizona project bill (S. 75).
 D. (6) \$3,211.50.
 E. (7) \$590.97; (9) \$590.97; (11) \$590.97.
- A. Adlin M. Downer, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy, etc. (3) VFW Foreign Service and VFW Legislative News Letter.
D. (6) \$1,625.
E. (7) \$36.50; (9) \$36.50; (11) \$36.50.
- A. Richard S. Doyle, 404 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Corporate income and excess profits taxes.
- A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) PR Notes.
D. (6) \$1,650.
E. (4) \$225; (9) \$225; (11) \$225.
- A. Robert M. Drysdale, Jr., Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.¹
D. (6) \$1,000.
E. (2) \$175; (4) \$112.10; (5) \$382.13; (6) \$135.92; (7) \$305.37; (9) \$935.52; (11) \$935.52.
- A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5-141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Supported amendments discussed and proposed to S. 2594 and S. 2645.
E. (9) \$749.22; (15) \$314.86, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc.; \$86.39, Plaza Hotel, New York City, N. Y., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc.; \$45.87, New York Central Railroad, transportation; \$15.41, Eastern Air Lines, transportation; \$30.25, Capital Airlines, transportation.
- A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, post office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) \$187.50.
E. (7) \$63.52; (11) \$63.52.
- A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.
- A. Matthew Dushane, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Seafarers International Union of North America, A. F. of L., 450 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) S. 1044, H. R. 3974, H. R. 5695, H. R. 5693.
D. (6) \$568.75.
- E. (5) \$41.25; (6) \$23; (7) \$385; (8) \$62; (9) \$511.25; (11) \$511.25.
- A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Petroleum legislation.
D. (6) \$3,000.
E. (7) \$672.65.
- A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) \$2.34.
E. (2) \$32.11; (4) \$0.44; (5) \$1.45; (7) \$2.20; (9) \$36.20; (11) \$36.20; (15) \$16.37, LaRoe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., counsel fee and expenses.
- A. George S. Eaton, 906 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, 906 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Bills especially affecting the interests of contract tool and die shops, which are small business.
D. (6) \$100.
- A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Registrant supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans; more specifically, the program of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.
D. (6) \$140.
E. (7) \$15; (9) \$15; (11) \$15.
- A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers.
C. (2) H. R. 2645; H. R. 3790; H. R. 5426; H. R. 2752; House Joint Resolution 218; H. R. 1637; S. 1144; S. 644. (3) Civil Engineering.
E. (8) \$9.50; (9) \$9.50; (11) \$9.50.
- A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building Thirteenth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools, and bills dealing with education for Korean veterans.
D. (6) \$900.
E. (6) \$85.37; (7) \$166.32; (9) \$251.69; (11) \$251.69.
- A. John Doyle Elliott, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Promotion toward passage of H. R. 2678, generally known as the Townsend Plan.
D. (6) \$910.
- A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which will further the country's rural electrification program, resulting from the REA act, as amended, including REA administrative and loan funds for rural electrification and for rural telephone funds; funds for the construction of multipurpose dams; funds for transmission and related facilities to deliver Federal hydropower to rural electric load centers; proposed legislation providing for surveys and development of water resources. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.
D. (6) \$4,908.08.
- A. Oatis H. Ellis, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 430 Syndicate Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers.
D. (6) \$3,000.
E. (9) \$1,193.86.
- A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the retail lumber and building materials dealers.
D. (6) \$2,750.
E. (7) \$319.35; (9) \$319.35; (11) \$319.35.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2585, utility relocation necessitated by highway construction, and legislation affecting public power projects generally.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the city's rights in the Colorado River and related matters, and legislation affecting public power projects.
D. (6) \$2,400.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 Sixteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) H. R. 7176, Interior Department appropriations bill, 1953, and legislation affecting social-security coverage for municipal employees, and legislation affecting California water interests generally.
D. (6) \$2,239.54.
E. (6) \$84.05; (7) \$22.27; (8) \$32.70; (9) \$139.54; (11) \$139.54.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the district's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.
D. (6) \$2,132.17.
E. (6) \$17.50; (8) \$14.67; (9) \$32.17; (11) \$32.17.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project and H. J. Res. 21 and S. J. Res. 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions; and legislation relating to reclamation and water-resources policies.
D. (6) \$7,501.02.
E. (7) \$396.27; (8) \$18; (9) \$414.27; (11) \$414.27.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
 C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the Central Valley project and legislation affecting Federal reclamation and public-power policies and projects generally.
 D. (6) \$1,750.
- A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
 C. (2) H. R. 7268, Army civil functions appropriations, 1953, and legislation affecting flood-control projects generally.
- A. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Postal-rate legislation.
 D. (6) \$2,020.70.
 E. (2) \$1,500; (4) \$77.23; (6) \$55.42; (7) \$1; (9) \$1,633.65; (15) \$1,556.42, Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses; \$28.50, Magazines of Industry, Inc., 400 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y., printing; \$17.31, Fred Keck Co., 305 East Forty-sixth Street, New York 17, N. Y., printing; \$31.92, H. P. Andrews Paper Co., 14 West Third Street, New York 12, N. Y., envelopes.
- A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
 C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly. (3) Pulling Together.
 D. (7) \$2,125.
 E. (7) \$544.66; (9) \$544.66; (11) \$544.66.
- A. Leon J. Engel (chairman, Jewelry Industry Tax Committee), 20 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md.
 C. (2) Excise taxes.
- A. O. F. Erickson, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Master Plumbers, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and piping industries. (3) Plumbing and Heating Business.
- A. Walter M. Evans, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
 B. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting tax equality which is favored by Virginia Associated Businessmen.
 D. (6) \$2,344.78.
 E. (7) \$94.78; (11) \$94.78.
- A. Herman Fakler, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) Interested myself in the repeal of section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and recommended that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration do not report favorably on S. Res. 169.
 D. (6) \$312.50.
 E. (6) \$88.19; (8) \$1.74; (9) \$89.93; (11) \$89.93.
- A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office), 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).
 C. (2) The general legislative interests of this organization are all matters affecting the interests of farmers or matters which from time to time may be regarded by the board of directors as affecting the program of the National Farmers Union as set forth in the program adopted by the convention of the National Farmers Union.
 D. (6) \$145,610.58.
 E. (15) \$24.54, The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service; \$36.20, Angus H. McDonald, Washington, D. C., travel, telephone, and newspaper expense; \$103.84, Dorchester House, Washington, D. C., rent; \$20, the Wall Street Journal, New York, N. Y., subscription; \$117.60, Tele-Sec, Washington, D. C., secretarial service; \$34.05, John A. Baker, Washington, D. C., travel, telephone, and newspaper expense, etc.¹
- A. Charles J. Farrington, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All Small Business Committee legislation; tax revision; funds for public roads; highway safety legislation.
 D. (6) \$6,249.99.
 E. (7) \$1,166.49; (11) \$1,166.49.
- A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.¹
 D. (6) \$11,497.65.
 E. (9) \$2,702.67.
- A. Abner H. Ferguson, 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.
 D. (6) \$900.
 E. (6) \$11; (9) \$11; (11) \$11.
- A. John A. Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
 B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting the natural gas industry.
 D. (6) \$3,750.
- A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.
- A. H. L. Filer, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
 B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
- C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (the Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.).
 D. (6) \$5,550.
- A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting the alcoholic beverage importing industry.
 D. (7) \$375.
- A. Robert I. Fine, 4044 Girard Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
 B. The Consumers' Lobby, 826 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation directly affecting the consumer.
 E. (6) \$1.50; (7) \$312; (8) \$15; (9) \$328.50; (11) \$328.50.
- A. James Finucane, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as mutual assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including universal military training and service, proposals leading to the drafting of peace treaties, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange.
 E. (7) \$188.74; (9) \$188.74; (11) \$188.74.
- A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Brown, Lund and Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.¹
 D. (6) \$1,350.
- A. Stephen E. Fitzgerald, doing business as the Stephen Fitzgerald Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; and Raymond C. Baker, Jay Richter, and Frank K. Kelly as employees.
 B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Assist the NAEC in articulating and expressing its point of view with respect to general legislative questions which affect the interests of the public and of electric light and power companies. (3)¹
 D. (6) \$15,166.67.
 E. (4) \$946.45; (6) \$329.59; (7) \$2,501.16; (8) \$235.42; (9) \$4,012.62; (11) \$4,012.62.
- A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Particularly interested in legislation in the general field of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.¹
 D. (6) \$1,031.25.
- A. Roger Fleming, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; Federal Food and Drug Act amendment; repeal of resale price maintenance; antitrust legislation; education; immigration legislation; Mexican farm-labor importation; method for computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; Sugar Act extension; Marketing Facilities Act; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; mutual security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; amendment of BIR code relation to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; postal rates; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; tobacco; peanut oil provisions of agricultural legislation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; national farmers day; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriation; Agriculture Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; family farm policy review; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service; universal military training; fair trade pricing study; United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty nations; farm credit legislation; appropriations for defense.

D. (6) \$1,166.66.
E. (7) \$89.41; (9) \$89.41; (11) \$89.41.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant disease control and crop improvement; items in Agriculture Department's budget affecting research and control work on black stem rust through plant breeding and barberry eradication.

D. (6) \$1,725.
E. (2) \$800; (4) \$158.40; (5) \$227.80; (6) \$75.07; (7) \$286.06; (9) \$1,547.33; (11) \$1,547.33.

A. W. G. Flinn, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizen Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.

E. (2) \$1,350; (8) \$53.60; (9) \$1,403.60; (11) \$1,403.60; (15) \$1,393.60, Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md., for professional services.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midway-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association.

D. (6) \$2,512.50.
E. (2) \$1,320; (6) \$6.19; (9) \$1,326.19; (11) \$1,326.19.

A. Herbert Fockler, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians. (3) ALA Washington Newsletter.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, suite 906-907, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, suite 906-907, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat-packing industry.

D. (6) \$5,000.04.

A. Aaron L. Ford, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Retained to assist in obtaining passage of a private bill to provide compensation from blocked or vested funds to Nicholas B. Perry for losses suffered as a result of seizure of his property by the Governments of Rumania or Hungary, or either of them.

E. (7) \$2.25; (9) \$2.25; (11) \$2.25.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679, bills to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys. (3) The Townsend National Weekly.

D. (6) \$1,040.

A. Forest Farmers' Association Cooperative, Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to forestry.¹ (3) The Forest Farmer.

D. (6) \$175.49.
E. (2) \$90; (4) \$15; (6) \$10; (7) \$90.49; (9) \$175.49; (11) \$175.49.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting transportation.¹

D. (6) \$7,956.68.
E. (7) \$147.62; (9) \$147.62; (11) \$147.62.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation pertaining to war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semimonthly.

D. (6) \$2,160.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

legislation favorable to the profession. (3) NARD Journal.

D. (6) \$2,800.
E. (2) \$675; (5) \$399; (6) \$105; (9) \$1,179; (10) \$2,396; (11) \$3,575.

A. James Frechette, Keshena, Wis.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

C. (2) Enactment of legislation which will provide for distribution of a portion of the tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to individual members of the tribe and allocate the remainder of the tribal funds for designated purposes indicated by the tribal council, etc.

A. John H. Frederick, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation, including pending bills before the House and Senate.

D. (6) \$2,029.69.
E. (7) \$79.69.

A. Fred J. Fredrickson, Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C. (Home address: 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.).

B. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

D. (6) \$2,570.24.
E. (5) \$130.74; (6) \$119.89; (7) \$1,170.61; (9) \$1,421.24; (11) \$1,421.24.

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.

D. (6) \$4,075.
E. (7) \$1,296.20; (9) \$1,296.20; (11) \$1,296.20.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In favor of H. R. 6846, a proposed amendment with respect to the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to prescribe certain fees and charges.

A. Fyffe and Clarke, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the manufacturing industry.

A. Charles E. Gage, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Minnesota Railroads.¹

C. (2) Interested in all matters affecting railroads, and particularly any matters relating to Railroad Retirement Act and pro-

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

posed amendments, Interstate Commerce Act, and proposed amendments, and Federal Employer's Liability Act and proposed amendments.

D. (6) \$500.

E. (7) \$355.99; (9) \$355.99; (11) \$355.99.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry, including S. 658 and House Resolution 520.

E. (7) \$57.50; (9) \$57.50; (11) \$57.50.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.; agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I.

C. (2) Legislation relating to World War I awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, such as H. R. 6074, Eighty-first Congress; H. R. 4702 and H. R. 5802, Eighty-second Congress.

E. (6) \$4.88; (7) \$86.67; (8) \$4.35; (9) \$100.80; (11) \$100.80.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; immigration legislation; Mexican farm-labor importation; agricultural labor; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; mutual-security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; United States relationship to North Atlantic Treaty Nations; farm-credit legislation; appropriations for defense.

D. (6) \$1,062.48.

E. (7) \$54.90; (9) \$54.90; (11) \$54.90.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and Legislative Letter.

D. (6) \$2,432.97.

E. (7) \$67.72; (8) \$2.75; (9) \$70.47; (11) \$70.47.

A. Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Explanation and analysis of Federal bills and rendering of advice concerning their relationship to ADA policy. (3) Journal of the American Dental Association.

D. (6) \$2,525.90.

E. (7) \$250.27; (9) \$250.27; (11) \$250.27.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.

A. Mrs. Paul Gebhard, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Division of social education and action, Board of Christian Education.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (2) S. 2298, H. R. 3392, H. R. 30, and H. R. 525.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, constituting the partnership of George, Brehmer & McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 133-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (2) S. 2298, H. R. 3392, H. R. 30, and H. R. 525.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal workers. (3) Union Postal Clerk.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. John S. Gibson, Sibbett Building, Douglas, Ga.

B. St. Marys Kraft Corp., St. Marys, Ga.

C. (2) An appropriation for dredging at St. Marys Harbor and up St. Marys River.

D. (6) \$750.

E. (7) \$209.75; (9) \$209.75; (11) \$209.75.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Legislation—Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education.

D. (6) \$1,340.83.

E. (7) \$63.30.

A. C. C. Gilbert, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.

D. (6) \$2,012.50.

A. William Glazier, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, and National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) General interests in legislation affecting trade unions and their members and the maritime industry as well.

D. (6) \$498.34.

E. (2) \$303.33; (4) \$17.78; (5) \$121.20; (6) \$121.34; (8) \$23.37; (9) \$587.02; (11) \$587.02; (15)¹

A. George S. Golstein, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) \$1,170.

E. (7) \$195; (9) \$195; (11) \$195.

A. A. Richard Gonzales, 825 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

B. National Farm Labor Union, AFL., 825 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Farm-labor legislation, immigration, social security, housing, health, fair-labor standards, and labor relations.

D. (6) \$800.

E. (2) \$800; (11) \$800.

A. Dr. H. T. Gordon, post-office box No. 2214, Washington, D. C.

B. The Townsend Legislative Bureau, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679.

D. (6) \$910.

E. (7) \$381.69; (9) \$381.69.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., suite 603, Washington, D. C.

B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Bills affecting the public health, such as H. R. 910 and S. 2301, nurses' education aid; S. 1245 and S. 2337, emergency maternity and infant care; S. 1140, Federal Department of Health; S. 1, universal military training.

D. (6) \$375.

A. Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees is of interest to this council.

D. (6) \$4,304.49.

E. (2) \$3,123.22; (4) \$181.24; (5) \$428.40; (6) \$123.19; (8) \$436.81; (9) \$4,292.86; (11) \$4,292.86; (15) \$2,277, Thomas G. Walters, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., services; \$819, Gladys M. Monroe, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., services.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation relative to interests of grain and feed trade.

D. (6) \$555.45.

E. (4) \$30; (7) \$50; (9) \$80; (11) \$80.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318-418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.

D. (6) \$2.

E. (2) \$3,686.55; (5) \$535.50; (6) \$79.21; (7) \$974.93; (8) \$32.06; (9) \$5,308.25; (11) \$5,308.25; (15) \$2,499.99, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., salary; \$1,186.56, Glenn C. Russell, 310 Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., salary; \$337.50, Labor, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., rent; \$26.02, Malloy Office Supply Co., 732 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., supplies; etc.¹

A. Cassius B. Cravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. David G. Gray, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

C. (2) Legislation affecting business in general, which includes practically every important measure before Congress.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- D. (6) \$1,500.
E. (6) \$95; (7) \$2,941.97; (9) \$3,036.97;
(11) \$3,036.97.
- A. Ernest W. Greene, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.
- A. Jerry N. Griffin, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and we are interested in any legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (6) \$1,200.
- A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Agriculture and the processing and transportation of the products thereof; also tax legislation.
D. (7) \$10,390.06.
E. (7) \$2; (9) \$2; (11) \$2.
- A. Mrs. Enid H. Griswold, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) \$300.
E. (7) \$35.75; (9) \$35.75; (11) \$35.75.
- A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program of organization. (3) ADA World.
D. (6) \$1,300.
E. (7) \$156.20; (9) \$156.20; (11) \$156.20.
- A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program of organization.
D. (6) \$1,462.50.
E. (7) \$466.17; (9) \$466.17; (11) \$466.17.
- A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.
- A. Harlan V. Hagdley, 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Respondent is interested in all legislation affecting Federal tax legislation on automotive products.
D. (6) \$625.
- A. Hugh F. Hall, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Government credit policies; transportation legislation; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; amendment of BIR code relating to tax treatment of livestock; grazing land; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriation; appropriation Agricultural Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; selective service; farm credit legislation; appropriations for defense.
D. (6) \$949.98.
E. (7) \$39.90; (9) \$39.90; (11) \$39.90.
- A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Proposed legislation supported or opposed: Price controls, slaughter quotas, land legislation, etc.
D. (6) \$2,350.
E. (6) \$33.90; (7) \$733.08; (8) \$4; (9) \$770.98.
- A. E. C. Halleck, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) \$3,354.12.
E. (7) \$454.26; (9) \$454.26; (11) \$454.26.
- A. Harry G. Hamlet, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, etc. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) \$750.
- A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, N. Y.
D. (6) \$2,176.86.
E. (7) \$1,051.86; (9) \$1,051.86; (11) \$1,051.86.
- A. William A. Hanscom, 1700 I Street NW., Suite 4, Washington, D. C.
B. Oil Workers International Union, CIO, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare—oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) \$1,830.
E. (7) \$180; (9) \$180; (11) \$180.
- A. Murray Hanson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business.
D. (6) \$600.
E. (2) \$97.50; (4) \$814.32; (5) \$126.24; (6) \$98.29; (7) \$94.15; (9) \$1,230.50; (15) \$98.94, Huff Duplicating Co., Inc., 1602 L Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing and mailing; \$612.38, Guthrie Lithograph Co., Inc., 1150 First Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing; \$83, Speed Dee Que, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing.
- A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation, local, State, Federal, or international, which affects the broadcasting industry.
D. (6) \$4,000.02.
E. (9) \$396.35.
- A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to transportation.
D. (6) \$481.25.
E. (7) \$37.90; (9) \$37.90; (11) \$37.90.
- A. Miss Elsie D. Harper, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Mutual security program (for), migratory-labor legislation (for), EMIC (for), UNICEF (for), civil rights (for), statehood of Alaska (for).
E. (2) \$150; (4) \$70; (6) \$20; (7) \$60; (9) \$300; (11) \$300.
- A. Robert E. Harper, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.
D. (6) \$4,500.
- A. Robert C. Harris, 440 Downing Avenue, Fort Wayne, Ind.
B. National Retired Teachers Association.
C. (2) Forand bill, H. R. 2764.
D. (6) \$675.20.
E. (6) \$6.10; (7) \$588.81; (8) \$80.29; (9) \$675.20.
- A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Maritime matters; interested in passage of S. 241, to amend Merchant Marine Act of 1936.
- A. Merwin K. Hart, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) \$500.
E. (7) \$250.43; (9) \$250.43; (11) \$250.43.
- A. Stephen H. Hart, 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters, including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deduction of soil conservation, brush control, and other ranching expenditures.
D. (6) \$5,135.
E. (9) \$491.68.

A. Dow W. Harter, 412-414 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
 C. (2) Legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of man-made domestic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes; also interested in the repeal or reduction of present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in certain other changes in our tax structure, and, generally, in other legislative proposals relating to tires and other manufactured rubber products which may come before Congress and committees thereof from time to time.
 D. (6) \$2,125.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.¹
 D. (6) \$3,375.
 E. (7) \$44.45; (9) \$44.45; (11) \$44.45.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
 B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. John C. Hazen, suite 808, Kass Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) H. R. 1938, LIFO; H. R. 3622 and other Fair Labor Standards Act amendments; H. R. 5505, Customs Simplification Act; H. R. 6174, S. 2504, and all other unemployment-compensation legislation; S. 2170, cotton labeling; S. 1267, fiber labeling; S. 2594, S. 2645, H. R. 6546, and all other amendments to Defense Production Act; S. 2918, H. R. 7256, H. R. 7257, H. R. 7258, and all other bills on flammable fabrics; Senate Resolution 169, H. R. 5189, and all other consumer interest proposals; H. R. 5767, H. R. 6367, and other price-maintenance legislation; all appropriation legislation; all proposals relating to parcel-post size and weight limitations; S. 106, District of Columbia optometry bill; S. 2712 and H. R. 6802, and other similar freight proposals. (3) Stores.
 D. (6) \$2,125.
 E. (6) \$15.54; (7) \$225.10; (8) \$1.25; (9) \$241.89.

A. Thomas P. Healy, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
 D. (6) \$1,714.90.
 E. (2) \$1,624.98; (7) \$89.92; (9) \$1,714.90; (11) \$1,714.90.

A. Felix Hebert, 602 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
 B. Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies, 1500 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
 C. (2) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code, section 207.
 E. (7) \$460.20; (9) \$460; (11) \$460.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. K. W. Heberton, room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.
 E. (7) \$126.90; (9) \$126.90; (11) \$126.90.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) National school health services bill, public school construction bill, national child research bill, Federal aid for medical education, local public health units, physically handicapped children's educational bill, school lunch appropriation, children's bureau appropriation, Cabinet status for the Federal Security Agency, Federal aid to day care centers in defense areas, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, emergency maternal and infant care, defense housing and community facilities.

A. Leo J. Heer, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting retail distribution of home goods; renewal of Defense Production Act; retention of Herlong amendment; discontinuance of consumer credit control authority.
 D. (6) \$500.
 E. (7) \$100; (9) \$100; (11) \$100.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
 D. (6) \$875.01.
 E. (7) \$220.18; (9) \$220.18; (11) \$220.18.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
 D. (6) \$1,608.06.
 E. (7) \$1,355.51; (9) \$1,355.51; (11) \$1,355.51.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Cannery Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.
 D. (6) \$2,312.50.
 E. (7) \$26.60; (9) \$26.60; (11) \$26.60.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
 B. American Association of Small Business, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
 C. (2) Legislation for the best interests of the people, particularly that beneficial to small business, and to oppose legislation harmful to the people, particularly that which is detrimental to small business. (3) Small Business Review.
 D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Ewart A. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any proposed legislation affecting the brewing and wool industries.¹
 D. (7) \$2,500.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ice-cream industry.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$1,398.82.
 E. (7) \$148.82; (9) \$148.82; (11) \$148.82.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 528 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 528 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) I have an interest in the current investigation on the use of chemicals on foods.

A. John L. Hoen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc., 40 Central Street, Boston, Mass.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the American merchant marine.
 D. (6) \$3,750.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to those objectives.
 D. (6) \$1,999.98.
 E. (7) \$4,300; (9) \$4,300; (11) \$4,300.

A. Robert L. Hogg, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect the life-insurance business.
 D. (6) \$2,500.
 E. (6) \$12.58; (7) \$532.58; (9) \$545.16; (11) \$545.16.

A. Charles W. Holman, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Coops and Legislative Letter.
 D. (6) \$4,125.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$250.

A. Victor Hood, 4209 Queensbury Road, Hyattsville, Md.
 B. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation affecting labor; National Defense Act, veterans' educational legislation, District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto; against H. R. 5234.
D. (6) \$1,805.47.
E. (7) \$440.47; (9) \$440.47; (11) \$440.47.

A. Jesse V. Horton, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service.
D. (6) \$2,400.
E. (7) \$101.72; (9) \$101.72; (11) \$101.72.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Harold K. Howe, Suite C, 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.
D. (6) \$2,649.99.
E. (2) \$929; (7) \$557.31; (9) \$1,486.31; (11) \$1,486.31.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.¹
D. (6) \$3,296.

A. Hudson, Creyke & Lipscomb, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. A joint venture organized in June 1950, for the purpose of obtaining relief for applicants for Federal leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Federal Government to assert title to submerged lands.

C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.
D. (6) \$600.

A. Becher A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation for higher tariffs and import quotas for screws, nuts, rivets, and similar fasteners.

A. Carroll B. Huntress, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.

B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; H. J. Res. 337 opposed.
E. (6) \$93.42; (7) \$1,068; (9) \$1,161.42; (11) \$1,161.42.

A. William C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.

D. (6) \$2,754.
E. (2) \$2,754; (6) \$27.85; (8) \$236.16; (9) \$3,018; (11) \$3,018.

A. Sam C. Hyatt, Hyattville, Wyo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) \$750; (9) \$750; (11) \$750; (15) \$750.
J. D. Snyder, room 1040, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Ill., salary.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

C. (2) Interested primarily in the preservation of independent banking.
D. (6) \$31,690.
E. (9) \$10,239.99.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the natural gas industry.
D. (6) \$61,475.54.

E. (2) \$5,750; (5) \$300; (9) \$6,050; (11) \$6,050; (15) \$3,750, John A. Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; \$1,250, W. E. Disney, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; \$750, Louis E. Whyte, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; \$300, Herbert Harvey Real Estate, Inc., 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., rent.

A. Carl Indergaard, Belfield, N. Dak.

B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak.

C. (2) Interested in a bill seeking the recovery of right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States.

A. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

E. (2) \$722.82; (5) \$69.53; (6) \$3.63; (9) \$795.98; (11) \$795.98; (15)¹

A. Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Bills affecting equality of taxation.
D. (6) \$390.
E. (5) \$89.40; (9) \$89.40.

A. Indians of California, Inc., 225 Powell Street, San Francisco, Calif., and 2838 Twenty-sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Congressional legislation affecting Indians of California.

D. (6) \$702.42.
E. (9) \$1,008.79.

A. William Ingles, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting industry.
D. (6) \$9,799.
E. (2) \$900; (5) \$675.60; (6) \$187.48; (7) \$114.33; (8) \$360; (9) \$2,237.41; (11) \$2,237.41.

A. Iowa Associated Businessmen, Inc., 463 Westwood Drive, Ames, Iowa.

C. (2) Such bills as H. R. 240, H. R. 1177, S. 892, H. R. 4473; in other words, we favor enactment of legislation that will produce real tax equality within the competitive field as relating to net annual incomes, savings, etc.
D. (6) \$1,747.50.

E. (2) \$886.50; (3) \$27; (4) \$17.10; (5) \$30.06; (6) \$29.06; (7) \$25; (8) \$5.72; (9) \$1,030.42.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman, including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

D. (6) \$1,650.
E. (1) \$750; (4) \$250; (5) \$150; (6) \$200; (7) \$300; (9) \$1,650; (11) \$1,650.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers, room 311-222, East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) General interest is in Federal and State legislation affecting the interest and welfare of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, including its affiliate local unions and members.

D. (6) \$3,750.
E. (2) \$3,750; (9) \$3,750; (11) \$3,750; (15) \$3,750, Fred A. Tobin, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., services.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (2) S. 2298; H. R. 3392; H. R. 30; H. R. 525.
D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Robert L. Irvin, 502 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif.

B. Long Beach Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.

C. (2) Tidelands legislation; supporting S. 940 and H. R. 4484.
D. (6) \$400.

E. (2) \$37.50; (5) \$168.20; (6) \$15.35; (7) \$578.89; (9) \$799.94; (11) \$799.94.

A. Boyd J. Jackson, Klamath Agency, Oreg.

B. Klamath Tribe of Indians.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Indians; interested in enactment of S. 737, S. 738, S. 1174, S. 1322, S. 1386, H. R. 264, H. R. 1632, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3094, H. R. 3095, H. R. 3363, and H. R. 3808.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price and production controls.

D. (6) \$1,300.
E. (6) \$6.35; (7) \$187.95; (8) \$30; (9) \$224.30; (11) \$224.30.

A. Seward H. Jacobi, Insurance Building, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.

B. Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting business and industry.
D. (6) \$2,750.

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, No. 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) A nominal interest in Federal legislation affecting savings and loan business, consisting of attending committee meetings when convenient to do so.

D. (6) \$300.
E. (5) \$125; (9) \$125; (10) \$300; (11) \$425.

A. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-discrimination Committee, Inc., 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

E. (1) \$657.58; (2) \$900; (3) \$93.34; (4) \$74.95; (5) \$316.19; (6) \$98.60; (7) \$78.65; (9) \$2,219.31; (15) \$600, Mike Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C., salary; \$300, Etsu Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C., salary; \$42.50, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., United States Code and supplements; etc.¹

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.

B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., and Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.

C. (2) Interested in retaining our present percentage depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays as shown in title 26, section 114, Internal Revenue Code.

E. (6) \$14.51; (7) \$280; (9) \$294.51; (11) \$294.51.

A. William T. Jobe, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General interest in matters affecting ice industry.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.

B. Dierks Lumber and Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation affecting lumber industry.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Tax legislation, labor legislation, amendments to the Clayton Act, merchant marine legislation, price-basing-point legislation, Defense Production Act, wage-stabilization legislation, St. Lawrence waterway.

E. (2) \$1,250; (8) \$950.38; (9) \$2,200.38; (11) \$2,200.38.

A. Elmer Johnson, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) The Annuitant.

E. (7) \$50; (9) \$50; (11) \$50.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping.

D. (6) \$2,916.

E. (7) \$59.54; (9) \$59.54; (11) \$59.54.

A. Vernon A. Johnson, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.

C. (2) All legislation affecting aviation.

D. (6) \$3,510.

E. (7) \$594.65; (9) \$594.65; (11) \$594.65.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Order of Railway Conductors, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project, and all legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.

A. Walter R. Johnson, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

D. (6) \$4,500.

E. (7) \$460; (8) \$72.80; (9) \$532.80; (11) \$532.80.

A. Willard Johnson, 56 Brook Manor, Pleasantville, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interest will continue until Senate ratification of Genocide Convention.

E. (4) \$416.75; (8) \$0.25; (9) \$417; (11) \$417; (15) \$409.25, Advance Printing Co., 324 East Twenty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y., printing.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) Reorganization of Department of Agriculture, special shepherd bill, McCarran-Walters omnibus immigration bill, customs simplification bill, extension of Defense Production Act, agricultural appropriation bills.

D. (6) \$2,500.02.

E. (6) \$128.87; (7) \$664.19; (8) \$184; (9) \$977.06; (11) \$977.06.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) As previously reported.

E. (8) \$13.95; (9) \$13.95; (10) \$13.95.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 1112 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.

C. (2) Interest in all legislation affecting the pottery industry.

A. Robert E. Jones, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Dairy Industry Committee, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislative matters affecting the dairy industry.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See p. 3.)¹

D. (6) \$3,000.

E. (7) \$254.31; (9) \$254.31.

A. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists & Proprietors International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, vet-

erans' educational legislation, the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto. Against H. R. 5234.

D. (6) 1 percent.

E. (2) 1 percent; (9) 1 percent.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

D. (6) \$2,325.

E. (7) \$505.60; (9) \$505.60; (14) \$505.60.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the sale or distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

D. (6) \$300.

E. (7) \$256.82; (9) \$256.82.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.

D. (6) \$1,374.

A. Thomas J. Keefe, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Road Builders' Association, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the road building industry.

D. (6) \$2,750.

E. (6) \$29.50; (7) \$1,135.85; (8) \$266.51; (9) \$1,431.86.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. City and County of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including civil functions appropriation, civil defense, payment in lieu of taxes, airports and aviation, merchant marine development, national defense appropriations, housing and urban development, transbay bridge, taxation and government controls.

D. (6) \$3,000.

E. (5) \$825;¹ (6) \$334.76;¹ (7) \$739.65;¹ (8) \$76.93;¹ (9) \$1,976.34.

A. Eugene Kelly, 1657 Harvard Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Foundation for Consumer Credit, Inc., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All consumer credit legislation.

D. (6) \$2,499.99.

E. (6) \$31.85; (7) \$909.10; (8) \$31.06; (9) \$972.01.

A. I. L. Kenen.

B. American Zionist Council, 305 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 7005.

D. (6) \$1,120.

E. (5) \$18.11; (7) \$390.74; (9) \$408.85; (15) \$102.05, April 4, 1952, Woodner Apartment, 3636 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., travel; \$18.11, March 13, 1952, Herbert Levy Co., 512 H Street NE. (stationery); \$57.56, March 13, 1952, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C. (conference luncheon).

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
 C. (2) (a) Amendments to Natural Gas Act of 1938 (H. R. 3285); (b) tidelands legislation (S. J. Res. 20, S. 940, H. R. 4484, etc.); (c) any tax bill that might affect the oil and gas industry; (d) antitrust legislation, that is, bills seeking to amend Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Robinson-Patman Act (H. R. 3408, H. R. 1233, and S. 719); H. R. 6157.
 D. (6) \$500.
 E. (2) \$125; (5) \$75; (6) \$50; (7) \$60; (8) \$25.
- A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
 C. (2) (See statement attached);¹ (3) The American Legion Magazine.
 D. (6) \$3,000.
 E. (2) \$1; (4) \$3.57; (5) \$1.23; (6) \$4.34; (7) \$171.75; (9) \$181.89; (15).¹
- A. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John Hanson, operating under name of "Mineral Recovery Trustees," Dickinson, N. Dak.
 C. (2) Seeking the recovery of right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States.
 E. (1) (See explanation attached);² (2) \$986.49; (4) \$242.97; (5) \$295.42; (8) \$2,575.90; (9) \$4,100.78.
- A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
 C. (2) (See statement filed with first quarterly report for 1950.)¹
 D. (6) \$2,550.
 E. (2) \$2,550 (includes \$2,250 regular compensation plus \$300 Washington expense allowance); (9) \$2,550.
- A. Omar B. Ketchum, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents and the welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; (3) VFW Foreign service and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
 D. (6) \$3,000.
 E. (7) \$109; (9) \$109.
- A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
 C. (2) Corporate income and excess profits taxes; (a) proposed amendment to the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 as amended by the Revenue Act of 1951; (b) no bill introduced as yet; (c) 64 Statutes 1137, chapter 1199; 65 Statutes 452, chapter 521; (d) for amendment of the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 as amended.
- A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.; manufacturer.
 C. (2) Employed to seek adoption of amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, H. R. 9827, Eighty-first Congress, second session, Public Law 909.
 D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. Allan B. Kline, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
 C. (2) Those matters affecting directly American agriculture.
 D. (6) \$1,250.
 E.¹
- A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Alloys Development Co., 2537 Koppers Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 C. (2) For H. R. 4054, to provide patent extensions.
 E. (7) \$9.50; (9) \$9.50; (10) \$62.77; (11) \$72.27.
- A. Robert E. Kline Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Palmer-Bee Co., Detroit, Mich.
 C. (2) Appearing before congressional committees relative to private bills for relief of Palmer-Bee Co., to reimburse company for loss of \$725,285.60 in manufacture of radar equipment for Navy. (a) Bill for relief of Palmer-Bee Co.; (b) S. 116 and H. R. 3739.
 E. (6) \$3; (9) \$3; (10) \$54; (11) \$57.
- A. Willford I. King, room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
 B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Favor all constitutional legislation according with sound economic principles.
 D. (6) \$2,975.
- A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
 C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
 D. (6) \$165.
 E. (7) \$208.05; (9) \$208.05.
- A. C. W. Kitchen, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.
- A. W. H. Kittrell, Empire Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
 B. Melben Oil Co., Benedum-Trees Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting oil industry, especially tidelands.
 D. (6) \$6,000.
 E. (6) \$349.44; (7) \$3,869.22; (8) \$40.90; (9) \$4,259.46; (15).¹
- A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
 D.¹
- A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
- C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
 E. (7) \$25.10; (9) \$25.10; (15) \$25.10.
- A. John Kolanda, room 413, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Railway Employees' Department, 229 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
 D. (6) \$2,400.
- A. John A. Kratz, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co., 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) For the enactment of S. 1000 and H. R. 3793, identical bills, to amend section 7 (h) of the Natural Gas Act.
- A. Alfred U. Krebs, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) S. 1221, ship warrants bill; H. R. 5678, revision of immigration laws; ILO Conventions Nos. 68, 69, 73, and 74; S. 2514, sale of vessels to Philippine citizens; S. 2550, revision of immigration laws; H. R. 5796, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Act.
 D. (6) \$500.
- A. Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry. Supporting S. 1212, H. R. 6102, H. R. 3177, H. R. 2608.
 D. (6) \$2,500.
- A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation; (a) Department of Interior Appropriation bill (fiscal 1953); (b) H. R. 7176.
 D. (6) \$3,492.
 E. (7) \$1,705.73; (8) \$196.14; (9) \$1,901.87; (15) \$1,084.94, February 2, 1952, through March 5, 1952, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C. (includes room, meals, valet, telephone, and telegraph, stenographic and miscellaneous items); \$256.40, February 2, 1952, through March 8, 1952, meals other than at Hotel Statler, including those on train; \$193.14, February 2, 1952, through March 8, 1952, taxis, tips, supplies, miscellaneous; \$364.39, February 1, 1952, through February 5, 1952, March 5, 1952, through March 8, 1952, train travel via Santa Fe and Southern Pacific.
- A. Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Center, Cleveland, Ohio. (See letter).¹
- A. Alfons Lands, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Director of Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc. No change from previous report.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

² Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

³ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, post-office box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) (Stated in attached data.)¹
- A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) \$900.
- A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 amendments. Department of Agriculture appropriation bill (meat inspection), H. R. 7123.
D. (6) \$1,500.¹
E. (5) \$2,755.13; (7) \$65.88; (9) \$2,821.01.
- A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 745 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 amendment; Department of Agriculture appropriation bill (meat inspection), H. R. 7123.
D. (6) \$4,500.¹
E. (5) \$2,755.13; (6) \$134.48; (7) \$383.56; (9) \$3,273.17.
- A. William V. Lavelle, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) \$1,750.
E. (7) \$1,666; (9) \$1,666.
- A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See report of American Trucking Associations, Inc.)
D. (6) \$6,499.98.
E. (7) \$7.35; (9) \$7.35.
- A. Joseph S. Lawrence, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare. (3) Bulletin and Capitol Clinic).
D. (6) \$4,410.92.
E. (7) \$758.07; (9) \$758.07.
- A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
- C. (2) The general legislative interests are resolutions, bills, and statutes relating to mining, smelting, and refining, and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce. Specifically, this includes but is not limited to the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, Eighty-second Congress, second session, October 10, 1951 (65 Stat. 373); ILO; custom duties, including copper such as Public Law 38, Eighty-second Congress, first session, May 22, 1951.
D. (6) \$6,250.
- A. Clarence F. Lea, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) I am interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation including pending bills before the House and Senate.
D.¹
E.¹
- A. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (3) The National Voter.
D. (6) \$1,707.50.
E. (2) \$481.25; (4) \$1,600.81; (6) \$11.53; (9) \$2,093.59.
- A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 30 Pine Street, New York, N. Y., and 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba. Sugar Act of 1948 and Public Law 140, Eighty-second Congress, amending the Sugar Act of 1948. Trade Agreements Act. Tariff acts.
D. (6) \$6,499.87.
E. (4) \$1,570.47; (6) \$2[^].90; (8) \$208.50; (9) \$1,799.87.
- A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.
- A. Robert E. Lee, 44 Westbrook Street, South Portland, Maine.
B. Active Retired Lighthouse Employees Association, post-office box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
C. (2) To aid in passage of H. R. 1526, H. R. 1995, H. R. 2273.
D. (6) \$300.86.
E. (6) \$13; (7) \$37; (9) \$50.
- A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education.
(3) (a) Legislative News, (b) Flash.
E. (2) \$1,558.96; (4) \$2,392.18; (5) \$46.68; (6) \$28.24; (7) \$335.09; (9) \$4,361.15.
- A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
- A. Joseph F. Leopold, 936 National City Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
- C. (2) Legislation relating to corporate income taxation.
D. (6) \$1,500.
E. (7) \$343.60; (8) \$216.09; (9) \$559.69.
- A. Wilbur R. Lester, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interest relates to mining, smelting and refining, and to foreign or international investment, trade or commerce. Specifically, this includes but it not limited to, the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, Eighty-second Congress, second session, October 10, 1951 (65 Stat. 373); ILO; custom duties, including copper such as Public Law 38, Eighty-second Congress, first session, May 22, 1951.
D. (6) See page 3.¹
- A. Arnold Levy, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Anthracite Institute, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the anthracite industry.
D. (6) \$4,557.89.
E. (6) \$10.39; (7) \$17.50; (8) \$30; (9) \$57.89.
- A. George J. Lewis, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.
- A. The Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The committee has a continuing interest in all legislation affecting the mechanical specialty contracting industries. The committee's preponderant interest is to keep its constituent associations informed of matters of this nature and to promote and advocate the passage of beneficial legislation concerning fair-bidding procedures, Federal contracting policies, controls, and subcontracting policies and procedures. In this connection the principal legislative interest is in S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes.
D. (6) \$4,266.
E. (2) \$4,250; (7) \$16; (9) \$4,266; (15) \$4,250, March 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C., legal fees; \$16, March 10, 1952, Carlton Hotel, Sixteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C., luncheon meeting.
- A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: Mutual assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including universal military training and service, proposals leading to the drafting of peace treaties, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange.
D. (6) \$1,309.64.
E. (7) \$84.65; (9) \$84.65.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power of life insurance or proceeds as it relates to Federal policies or measures which are deemed to be inflationary in character. (a-b-c). House Joint Resolution 323 for limiting income tax rates.

E. (2) \$2,938.47; (4) \$3,478.38; (5) \$934.67; (6) \$166; (7) \$1,871.60; (8) \$902.95; (9) \$10,292.07; (15)¹

A. L. Blain Liljenquist, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) As Washington representative, I support or oppose legislation affecting the livestock and meat industry. During the first quarter of 1952 my chief legislative interest was to oppose the extension of price and wage controls. These controls are socialistic, arbitrary, unworkable, inequitable, add to the cost of goods, create disrespect for law and government, and should be promptly terminated. Other legislation with which I was concerned in the first quarter were items in the appropriation bills for agriculture and the Department of Defense that relate to the livestock and meat industry.

D. (6) \$2,500.02.

E. (7) \$45; (8) \$38.01; (9) \$83.01; (15) \$38.01, March 4, 1952, Batt, Bates & Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., mimeographing; \$31, March 10, 1952, Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

C. (2) (a) Amendment to title V of Independent Offices Appropriation Act 1952; (b) H. R. 6846; (c) a proposed amendment with respect to the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to prescribe certain fees and charges; (d) in favor of the bill.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).¹

D. (6) \$3,041.67.

E. (6) \$30.85; (7) \$499.49; (8) \$129.23; (9) \$659.57; (15) \$58.29, January 14-19, Mayfair Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., room; \$15, February 1, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues; \$20, February 1, Public Utilities Advertising Association, Dubuque, Iowa, dues; \$40.10, February 8-12, Mayfair Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., room; \$16.50, February 11, Mississippi Valley Association, banquet tickets, etc.¹

A. Norman M. Littell, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Navajo Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. Address of Superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz.

C. (2) S. 2954, H. R. 5634, H. R. 6035.

D. (6) \$1,875.

A. Walter J. Little, 810 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Southern Pacific Co. et al.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.¹

A. Gordon C. Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, box 1107, Shreveport, La.

C. (2) Interested in S. 1889 and H. R. 5632. Both provide for amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act. We are opposed to some provisions of S. 1889. We are opposed to the enactment of any part of H. R. 5632.

D. (5) \$4,500.

A. F. S. Lodge, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, "to implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes"; and bills in the Eighty-second Congress such as S. 1693, "to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes"; and H. R. 1755, "to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes."

D. (6) \$25.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks. War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951. S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, and S. 1848, and similar bills in House of Representatives. No position for or against this legislation.

E. (6) \$129.37; (7) \$106.25; (9) \$235.62; (15) March 6, Mr. Long's personal expenses to Washington, D. C., March 4-6, meals, hotel, taxis, etc. (no item over \$10), \$31.40; Western Union telegram, November 16, Chicago, \$1.11; Michigan Bell Telephone, long-distance telephone (legislation and other business), \$128.26; B. & O. Railroad, fare to Washington and return, \$74.75.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Agency of Canadian Car and Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

A. Otto Lowe, University Club, Washington, D. C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.

D. (7) \$1,500.

E. (7) \$500; (9) \$500.

A. Mrs. Frances B. Lucas, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Defense Committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In general, all legislation concerning defense and freedom; all bills concerning world government, such as S. 56, S. 57, and S. 66; and all bills relating to socialized medicine.

D. (7) \$100.

E. (7) \$13; (9) \$13.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See p. 3).¹

D. (6) \$750.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in aiding company as consultant counsel in connection with Federal tax matters affecting life insurance companies.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation which may deal with credit controls.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Traller Coach Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislative interest in tax bills and other measures intended to classify trailer coaches as mobile homes.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Dr. Carl E. Lunn, 2315 East Yale Street, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) H. R. 2679, the Townsend Plan.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

C. (See statement attached to preliminary report filed June 7, 1951).¹

D. (6) \$1,249.80.

E. (5) \$60.45; (6) \$36.04; (9) \$96.49.

A. A. L. Lynn, vice president, Island Creek Coal Co., Pond Creek Pocahontas Co., Huntington, W. Va.

C. (2) I am interested generally in all legislation affecting the coal industry, such as taxes, transportation, Government controls, Government expenditures, etc.

D. (7) \$5,500.

A. John C. Lynn, American Farm Bureau Federation, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) (See attached).¹

D. (6) \$2,156.02.

E. (7) \$88.84; (9) \$88.84.

A. A. E. Lyon, Railroad Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Employer listed above.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor. All bills affecting Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Act.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Am generally interested in legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries which may be clients of Hill & Knowlton.

A. Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, specifically S. 2639 to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and S. 2937 to amend the Railway Labor Act.

D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. Specific interests: S. 2358, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; S. 2361, a bill to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers; S. 2362, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain operations of private carriers by motor vehicle, and to restrict the leasing of vehicles. Position: Generally in opposition to all three, but favorable to amendments thereof.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Edward A. McCabe, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.

D. (6) \$2,250.

E. (7) \$231.50; (9) \$231.50.

A. John A. McCart, room 716, AFGE, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.

D. (6) \$1,384.62.

E. (7) \$15.20; (9) \$15.20.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) (See attached statement).¹

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education.

D. (6) \$218.13.

A. Bryson deHaas McCloskey, 404 Woodford Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

E. (4) \$27; (11) \$27.

A. Warren C. McClure, Box 207, Camden, Ark.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation relating to soil conservation and flood control.

D. (6) \$1,467.50.

A. Glen McDaniel, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Special legislative interests are: Extension Defense Production Act, FCC appropriation bill, Walsh-Healey Act, S. 2325 (Bureau of Accident Prevention), S. 2714 (Industrial Safety Act, H. R. 6219) (Household Appliance Instruction Booklet Act).

A. Angus McDonald, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).

A. A. J. McFarland, 26 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.

B. Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.

C. (2) Christian amendment bills, House Joint Resolution 156, Senate Joint Resolution 29.

D. (6) \$810.

E. (7) \$550; (9) \$550.

A. Richard McGough, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

B. Washington Railroad Association.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Taxpayers, U. S. A.

D. (6) \$1.80.

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 923 Chestnut Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation in connection with parcel post.

D. (6) \$1,460.

E. (7) \$678.71; (9) \$678.71.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific: See page 3.¹

D. (6) \$287.50.

E. (7) \$6.27; (9) \$6.27.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In addition to the bills listed in the previous report, all of which have some relation direct or indirect to the practice of the profession of optometry, S. 2325, S. 2552, S. 2714, S. 2738, H. R. 7320, H. R. 6319, H. R. 6921, H. R. 6720, on behalf of the District of Columbia and American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio; on behalf of Ruth Obre Dubonnet, 50 East Seventy-second Street, New York City, bill to reacquire American citizenship, S. 1772; on

behalf of Vera Sarah Keenan, Franton Court, Greens Farms, Connecticut, bill to permit residence in the United States, S. 1126; on behalf of John J. Braund, 900 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., H. R. 4507, bill to compensate John J. Braund for use of patents by the United States Government.

D. (6) \$3,175.

E. (6) \$94.21; (7) \$50.80; (8) \$9.35; (9) \$154.36.

A. Lachlan Macleay, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Matters relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

D. (6) \$4,500.

E. (7) \$703.57 (see attached); (9) 0753.57.

A. Mackoff, Kellogg, Muggli & Kirby, Dickinson, N. Dak.

B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak.

C. (2) Interested in S. 2563 and H. R. 6368 giving former owners of lands sold to the United States the right to repurchase the minerals in said lands.

E. (6) \$106.14; (7) \$2,253.10; (9) \$2,359.24; (12) \$203.98.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1908 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting shipping, including: S. 241, H. R. 4729, amendment of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; S. 2950, wages of crew members; H. R. 6245, remission of duties on dunnage; H. R. 5694, Delaware and Chesapeake Canal, lighting system; Senate Joint Resolution 27, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; H. R. 6947, Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; H. R. 7072, Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953.

D. (6) \$1,050.

E. (7) \$31.43; (9) \$31.43.

A. Harry J. Maginnis, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Postal legislation; (a) rate increase bills.

D. (6) \$2,500.

E. (6) \$107.18; (7) \$257.03; (9) \$364.21.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbook Road, Falls Church, Va.

B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.

D. (6) \$600.

E. (6) \$19; (7) \$157.98; (9) \$176.98.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbook Road, Falls Church, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry.

D. (6) \$2,600.

E. (6) \$19; (7) \$107.98; (9) \$176.98.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2).¹

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- D. (6) \$16,375.¹
E.¹ (1) \$15,000; (8) \$1,375; (9) \$16,375.
- A. Mrs. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$1,400.
E. (8) \$64.30; (9) \$64.30.
- A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 300 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members. H. R. 1316, 3022, 1612, 257, 7408, 2658, 1019, 3282, House Joint Resolution 102, 7, 4; S. 1, 1040, 397, 990, 984, 1301, 1310.
D. (6) \$3,296.
- A. Baird H. Markham, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
- A. Winston W. Marsh, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached p. 3 for answers to items 1-3.)¹
- A. Robert F. Martin, 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Senate Resolution 253 and S. 2473.
- A. Mrs. Etsu M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States (legislation is a part of this activity): (a) To provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in occupied Japan, H. R. 2865. (b) To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, S. 865. (c) To revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, S. 2055 and H. R. 5678 and similar bills.
D. (6) \$300.
- A. Mike M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States (legislation is a part of this activity): (a) To provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in occupied Japan, H. R. 2865. (b) To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, S. 865. (c) To revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, S. 2055 and H. R. 5678 and similar bills.
D. (6) \$600.
- A. Will Maslon, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York City.
B. American Jewish Congress, Inc.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) \$112.50.
- A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) \$2,364.
E. (2) \$2,364; (8) \$167.50; (9) \$2,550.
- A. P. H. Matthews, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See Rider C-2).¹
D. (6) \$4,399.98.
E. (7) \$355; (9) \$355; (15) Harvey's Restaurant, Washington, D. C., for meals, \$62.19.
- A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Health and welfare.
D. (6) \$2,781.53.
E. (7) \$60.40; (9) \$60.40.
- A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters.
D. (6) \$16,500.
E. (2) \$1,650; (4) \$225; (9) \$1,875.
- A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine.
D. (6) \$18,610.
E. (8) \$18,610; (9) \$18,610.
- A. E. A. Meeks, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affect the interest of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association; Crosser bill amending Railroad Retirement Act. (H. R. 3669.)
D. (6) \$1,320.
- A. Ross A. Messer, Room 512, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C. (Room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.)
C. (2) All beneficial legislation affecting custodial employees of the Post Office and GSA. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) \$500.
E. (7) \$40.90; (8) \$84.80; (9) \$125.70.
- A. Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower, Lansing, Mich.
C. (2) In favor of legislation designed to have all business corporations taxed in the same manner and on the same basis.
- A. Mr. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attachment "A.")¹
D. (6) \$1,312.
E. (6) \$45.01; (7) \$34.50; (9) \$79.51.
- A. Harold M. Miles, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Anything affecting the steam railroads and specifically the St. Lawrence waterway bill, House Joint Resolution 337.
D. (6) \$275.
- A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attached statement, p. 3).¹
D. (6) \$1,831.70.
E. (2) \$200; (3) \$1,500; (4) \$128.20; (7) \$3.50; (9) \$1,831.70; (15).¹
- A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills.
D. (6) \$1,500.
E. (2) \$125; (5) \$44.31; (6) \$13.80; (7) \$474.09; (8) \$242.80; (9) \$900.
- A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston.
C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations; H. R. 7268.
D. (6) \$1,500.
E. (5) \$13.49; (6) \$58.22; (7) \$613.24; (8) \$4; (9) \$688.95.
- A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For retention of existing depletion allowances in tax laws.
D. (6) \$1,500.
E. (5) \$829.84; (6) \$62.85; (7) \$437.65; (8) \$132.58; (9) \$1,462.92.
- A. Miller, Gorham, Wescott and Adams, and William Simon a partner thereof, Room 3500, One North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Good faith competition—S. 719 and H. R. 2820.
E. (6) \$107.04; (7) \$1,225.52; (8) \$261.70; (9) \$1,594.26.
- A. Justin Miller, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.¹
D. (6) \$9,733.39.
E. (9) \$983.41.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Miller's National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

E. (2) \$312.50; (6) \$88.19; (8) \$1.74; (9) \$402.43.

A. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Federal and State income taxation and governmental expenditures.

D. (6) \$1,017.50.
E. (3) \$918.10; (4) \$31.58; (5) \$155; (8) \$50.60; (9) \$1,155.28; (15) \$918.10, National Associated Businessmen, Washington, D. C., contribution; \$50.60, Bachman Anderson, Inc., St. Paul, bond and phone; \$155, Norman E. Blorn, St. Paul, stenographers and postage; \$31.58, St. Paul Letter Co., St. Paul, postage, mimeographing, mailing.

A. Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltham Building, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) Association is interested in legislation relating to taxation of independent business, labor legislation, and encroachment of Government into private industry.

D. (7) \$40.
E. (4) \$243.09; (5) \$13.24; (7) \$71; (9) \$927.33; (15)¹.

A. Missouri Valley Chapter Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 301-303 Millsaps Building, post-office box 1329, Jackson, Miss.

C. (2) Legislation relating to Government economy, Government regulation of business and taxation, such as Mason bill, H. R. 240, Davis bill, H. R. 1177, and Senator Williams' bill, S. 892.

D. (6) \$2,447.50.
E. (2) \$503.92; (4) \$254.86; (5) \$120; (6) \$135.68; (7) \$101.27; (8) \$20; (9) \$1,135.73; (15)¹.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Proposed legislation supported or opposed: Price controls, slaughter quotas, hide exports, transportation legislation, meat inspection appropriation, foot-and-mouth disease, land legislation, etc.

D. (6) \$4,400.
E. (6) \$117.34; (7) \$960.19; (8) \$198.64; (9) \$1,276.17.

A. Donald Montgomery, 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) \$1,300.
E. (6) \$24.30; (7) \$417.15; (9) \$441.45.

A. William W. Mooney, 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash.

B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Townsend plan bills in the Ways and Means Committee, H. R. 2878 and H. R. 2679. (3) Townsend National Weekly.

D. (6) \$1,309.86.
E. (3) \$17; (7) \$206.73; (9) \$223.73.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of American Shipowners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) S. 2325, S. 2714, S. 2352, S. 2355, and S. 2487. (3) Shipping Survey.

A. Morris Plan Corp. of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation.

A. Giles Morrow, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Testified in favor of bills S. 2712, to require certificates of public convenience and necessity prior to engaging in service as a freight forwarder; and S. 2713, to provide more definite standards for exemption from part IV of act.

D. (6) \$3,750.
E. (5) \$27.60; (6) \$4.42; (7) \$27.60; (9) \$59.62.

A. Harold G. Mosler, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.

B. The Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) All legislation in the aircraft field.
D. (6) \$3,000.
E. (6) \$114.03; (7) \$303.55; (8) \$3; (9) \$420.58.

A. Moss & Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Interested in the Defense Production Act of 1950 (S. 2645) and such other bills as may pertain to economic controls over industry.

E. (5) \$4.25; (6) \$29.56; (7) \$86; (8) \$21.28; (9) \$141.09.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Movers Conference of America, Sixteenth and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the moving industry; in particular, S. 2653, a bill to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees, which we support.

D. (6) \$832.
E. (4) \$832; (9) \$832; (15) \$16, Walter Conway and Associates, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C., composition expense; \$522, Federal Lithograph Co., 6011 Blair Road NW., Washington, D. C., printing of two letters and testimony given before Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of S. 2653.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.

C. (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.

D. (6) \$300.
E. (9) \$300.

A. John S. Murphy, 355 Boyce Building, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

B. American Pyrotechnics Association, 6711 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md.

D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) \$99.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga.

C. (2) H. R. 7314, H. R. 3994, S. 1767, H. R. 2572, S. 1149, H. R. 5474, H. R. 565, H. R. 3527. (3) The Forest Farmer.

D. (6) \$60.
E. (6) \$10; (7) \$90.49; (9) \$100.49.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.

D. (7) \$749.70.
E. (2) \$500; (4) \$60; (5) \$164.60; (7) \$25.10; (9) \$749.70.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in laws affecting businessmen, particularly with relation to taxation, labor, Government regulation of business, social security, and tax-privileged corporations in business. (3) Washington Report.

E. (2) \$3,185.54; (4) \$90.72; (5) \$858.88; (6) \$127.03; (8) \$379.80; (9) \$4,641.97; (15)¹.

A. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

E. (2) \$5,087.55; (4) \$51.50; (5) \$445.88; (6) \$298.29; (7) \$685.30; (8) \$939.01; (9) \$7,557.53; (15)¹.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418-419 Homer Building, 601 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all types, particularly bills relating to GI education for Korean veterans. (3) The Business School News and the Executive.

D. (6) \$6,019.42.
E. (2) \$3,871.07; (4) \$673.37; (5) \$2,438.88; (6) \$198.49; (7) \$2,100.42; (8) \$912.74; (9) \$10,194.97; (15)¹.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Co.'s, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (2) S. 2298, H. R. 3392, H. R. 30, H. R. 525.

D. (6) \$13,262.50.
E. (4) \$1.79; (6) \$31.14; (8) \$5.28; (9) \$38.21.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Federal legislation that might affect members as going electric utilities.¹ (3)¹.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- D. (6) \$402,699.88.
E. (1) \$11,294.63; (2) \$71,950.64; (3) \$25; (4) \$2,325.66; (5) \$6,996.45; (6) \$1,784; (7) \$4,712.48; (8) \$3,682.41; (9) \$102,771.27; (15) \$11,294.63, The Stephen, Fitzgerald Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York City, public relations services; \$235.46, Fox-Jones Co., 509 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; \$64.84, Gardner Display Co., 1937 West Hastings Street, Chicago, Ill., storage charges; \$23.98, M. S. Ginn & Co., 1417 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies, etc.¹
- A. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The association has a general legislative interest in statutes or bills which affect the interests of independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.
D. (6) \$1.52.
E. (4) \$1.52; (9) \$1.52.
- A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) War Damage Corporation legislation, social security legislation, insurance legislation, tax equality legislation, wage, salary, and manpower control legislation. (3) American Agency Bulletin.
D. (6) \$2,633.43.
E. (2) \$3,369.02; (5) \$427.64; (6) \$297.92; (7) \$207.68; (8) \$120; (9) \$4,422.26; (15)¹
- A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) \$241,616.42.
E. (2) \$3,674; (4) \$3,994.93; (6) \$250; (7) \$995; (9) \$8,913.93; (15) \$3,994.93, Ransdell, Inc., 810 Rhode Island Avenue NE, Washington, D. C., printing and mailing; \$995, Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner honoring members of Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees.
- A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in passage of H. R. 3207, to amend Navy Ration Statute (34 U. S. C. 902a); interested in any other legislation that may relate to margarine.
D. (6) \$56.
E. (2) \$50; (7) \$6; (9) \$56.
- A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 2517 and S. 2564, establishing branch policy for Federal savings and loan associations, both of which the savings banks supported.
D. (6) \$164.50.
E. (2) \$154.50; (7) \$10.25; (9) \$164.50; (15) \$164.50, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., services.
- A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and Postal Service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) \$9,992.48.
E. (2) \$2,400; (4) \$1,791.65; (5) \$300; (6) \$30; (7) \$101.72; (9) \$4,623.37; (15)¹
- A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Room 512-513 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Beneficial legislation affecting Postal employees and General Service employees, and Post Office Custodial employees and GSA in PBS employees, in particular. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) \$14,085.46.
E. (2) \$644.76; (4) \$277.85; (5) \$110; (6) \$18.71; (7) \$40.90; (8) \$294; (9) \$1,386.22; (15)¹
- A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Public Relations Department and its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) \$75,321.77.
E. (1) \$60; (2) \$19,022.46; (4) \$1,305.56; (5) \$2,487.17; (6) \$913.86; (7) \$3,461.76; (8) \$684.54; (9) \$27,935.35; (15) \$60, Chittenden Press Service, 1872 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., pick-up service for press releases; \$583.30, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., reimbursement for services performed; \$1,953.48, John C. Williamson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., legal service rendered; etc.¹
- A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees, particularly during this quarter, S. 995, S. 500, and H. R. 6294. (3) The Annuitant.
D. (6) \$200.
E. (4) \$250; (7) \$50; (9) \$300.
- A. National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, 4543 North Hicks Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States storekeeper-gaugers.
D. (6) \$557.40.
E. (2) \$500; (9) \$500; (15) \$500, Robert E. McLaughlin, % Roberts & McInnis, 400 DeSales Building, Connecticut Avenue and DeSales Streets, Washington, D. C., legal services.
- A. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Mutual security program (for); migratory labor legislation (for); EMIC (for); UNICEF (for); civil rights (for); statehood of Alaska (for).
E. (2) \$150; (4) \$70; (6) \$20; (7) \$60; (9) \$300.
- A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., suite 55, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodical published by members of the above-named association.
E. (2) \$600; (9) \$600.
- A. National Cannery Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.
D. (6) \$198,286.44.
E. (2) \$3,817.50; (4) \$24.71; (6) \$19.44; (7) \$869.68; (8) \$51.61; (9) \$4,778.44; (15) \$2,312.50, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., salary; \$1,500, Otto Lowe, Washington, D. C., legal services; \$26.60, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., local transportation; \$70.67, Henry P. Taylor, Walkerton, Va., travel expense; \$51, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., subscriptions; etc.¹
- A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous-coal industry.
D. (6) \$460,450.98.
E. (9) \$33,608.01.¹
- A. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation.
D. (6) \$1,130.65.
E. (2) \$6,839.46; (9) \$6,839.46; (15) \$6,839.46, Wyatt, Grafton & Grafton, Marion E. Taylor Building, Louisville, Ky., professional services.
- A. National Committee To Limit Federal Taxing Powers, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to taxes and the national debt.
D. (6) \$774.
E. (4) \$112.24; (8) \$60; (9) \$172.24; (15)¹
- A. National Committee for Strengthening Congress, 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests include any and all legislation dealing with the organization of Congress.
D. (6) \$100.
E. (4) \$343.23; (6) \$16.19; (7) \$197.65; (9) \$557.07.
- A. National Consumers League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Labor legislation, such as minimum wage, social security, child labor, migratory labor, etc. (3) National Consumers League Bulletin.
D. (7) \$2,781.55.
E. (1) \$50; (2) \$500; (4) \$475; (5) \$293.53; (6) \$82.34; (7) \$138.26; (9) \$1,539.18.
- A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn., and 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
D. (6) \$396.79.
E. (2) \$357.50; (5) \$27.40; (6) \$11.89; (9) \$296.79; (15) \$312.50, Callaway & Reed, Dallas and Washington, retainer; \$45, Louise Palne, Memphis, Tenn., salary.
- A. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) \$5,047.49.
E. (2) \$3,825.42; (4) \$65.74; (5) \$274.53; (6) \$12.78; (7) \$869.02; (9) \$5,047.49; (15) Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., salary and expense, \$2,014; Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expense, \$251.02; William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., salary and expense, \$635.63; J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expense, \$764.49; Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., salary and expense, \$373.05; etc.¹
- A. National Council Against Conscriptio, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Its only legislative interest is opposition to peacetime conscription. (3) Conscriptio News.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- D. (6) \$15,420.08.
E. (2) \$1,275.95; (4) \$10,464.16; (5) \$278.54; (6) \$95.09; (7) \$664.89; (8) \$18.91; (9) \$12,797.54; (15).¹
- A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) S. 2394, and all other similar legislation relating to the postal service.
D. (7) \$2,459.76.
E. (1) \$833.33; (4) \$997.83; (5) \$102.86; (6) \$12.65; (7) \$513.09; (9) \$2,459.76; (15) \$149.47, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., meals and lodging; \$793.27, Geo. F. McKiernan & Co., 1035 West Van Buren, Chicago, Ill., printing; \$204.56, Olson Letter Service, 19 South LaSalle, Chicago, Ill., mimeographing; \$833.33, Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., public relations counsel; etc.¹
- A. National Council of Coal Lessors, Inc., 316 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of lessors of coal lands.
D. (6) \$13,800.
E. (2) \$3,897.7; (4) \$88.50; (5) \$104.34; (6) \$3.50; (8) \$55.22; (9) \$4,149.31.
- A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2357, to restrict application of agricultural exemption for motor carriers (opposed); S. 2362, to restrict certain operations of private motor carriers and to restrict leasing of vehicles (opposed); S. 2518, to change procedure for increasing freight rates (opposed); S. 2319, to redefine the rule of rate-making (opposed).
D. (6) \$2,870.
E. (2) \$1,688; (4) \$84.92; (5) \$61.61; (6) \$86.92; (7) \$103.65; (9) \$2,024.51; (15).¹
- A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Restriction of immigration, suppression of communism, patriotic legislation, support American free public schools. (3) Junior American.
E. (3) \$249.99; (4) \$252.50; (6) \$91.03; (7) \$130.57; (9) \$724.09.
- A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as mutual assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation, including universal military training and service, proposals leading to the drafting of peace treaties, economic assistance, disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange. (3) Peace Action.
D. (6) \$11,034.23.
E. (2) \$5,974.89; (3) \$112.50; (4) \$1,008.08; (5) \$1,814.69; (6) \$175.18; (7) \$483.81; (8) \$1,461.29; (9) \$11,230.44; (15).¹
- A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Our legislative interests are in favor of any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and in opposition to any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) \$38,520.01.
E. (2) \$21,845.29; (4) \$6,016.79; (5) \$4,639.28; (6) \$887.78; (7) \$1,022.80; (8) \$865.54; (9) \$35,277.48; (11) \$35,277.48.
- A. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance, S. 1140, S. 337, H. R. 54, H. R. 274, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, S. 401.
D. (6) \$15,233.05.
E. (1) \$12,156.21; (4) \$3,076.84; (9) \$15,233.05; (15) \$1,216.54, Low's Letter Service, 205 West Monroe, Chicago, Ill., printing, mimeographing, and mailing; \$159.78, Medical Mailing Service, Inc., 2611 Indiana, Chicago, Ill., storage and mailing; \$873.09, Norman Letter Service, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., mimeographing and mailing; \$144.78, Lincoln Printing Co., 732 Sherman, Chicago, Ill., printing and mailing; \$1,800, E. Hofer & Sons, 1405 Southwest Harbor Drive, Portland, Oreg., subscription; \$10,356.21, Campaigns, Inc., 1607 De Young Building, San Francisco, Calif., reimbursement for purchase of radio time and newspaper advertising; etc.¹
- A. National Electrical Contractors' Association, Inc., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. Qualified Contractor.
E. (2) \$1,500; (8) \$4,027.50; (9) \$5,527.50.
- A. National Electrical Manufacturers' Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act.
D. (6) \$621.
- A. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting shipping.¹
E. (2) \$6,931.25; (5) \$1,350; (6) \$207.04; (7) \$267.87; (9) \$8,756.16.
- A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., are those which affect favorably or adversely the interests of women in business and the professions. (3) The Independent Woman.
D. (6) \$26,474.40.
E. (2) \$375; (4) \$125; (5) \$240.78; (6) \$74.28; (8) \$24.08; (9) \$1,339.14; (15) \$125, National Printing Co., Third and N Streets NE., Washington, D. C., printing.
- A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, room 502, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk and Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) \$157,690.92.
E. (2) \$7,537.09; (4) \$18,467.96; (5) \$380; (6) \$395.83; (8) \$5,777.48; (9) \$32,558.36; (15).¹
- A. National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools.
D. (6) \$550.
E. (4) \$195.28; (6) \$170.93; (7) \$177.20; (9) \$543.41.
- A. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Investigation into grain storage and the various bills to amend the Defense Production Act.
D. (6) \$21,420.
E. (9) \$17,374.38.
- A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The National Housing Conference is interested in all housing legislation.
D. (6) \$18,060.17.
E. (1) \$16.80; (2) \$7,666.28; (3) \$220; (4) \$125.89; (5) \$2,008.25; (6) \$453.92; (7) \$647.53; (8) \$3,424.21; (9) \$14,562.88; (15).¹
- A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) \$123.86.
E. (1) \$20.97; (2) \$117.82; (4) \$50.82; (5) \$23.11; (6) \$2.74; (7) \$22.65; (9) \$238.11; (11) \$238.11; (15).¹
- A. National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to the tariff and foreign trade.
E. (1) \$49.73; (2) \$1,649.35; (4) \$166.15; (5) \$1,227.62; (6) \$95.24; (7) \$173.12; (8) \$70.14; (9) \$3,431.35; (11) \$3,431.35; (15).¹
- A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Livestock taxation.
D. (6) \$2,414.32.
E. (9) \$5,626.68.
- A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber-manufacturing industry. (3) National Lumber News.
D. (6) \$16,001.64.
E. (1) \$2,638.30; (2) \$3,532.26; (4) \$1,549.62; (5) \$311.70; (6) \$64.42; (7) \$1,476.70; (8) \$1,325.16; (9) \$10,898.16; (11) \$10,898.16; (15).¹
- A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) Dairy Director and News for Dairy Co-Ops.
D. (6) \$54,999.10.
E. (1) \$2,732.04; (2) \$26,753.06; (3) \$5,000; (4) \$3,938.32; (5) \$2,061.50; (6) \$904.63; (7) \$3,079.29; (8) \$6,238.88; (9) \$50,707.72; (11) \$50,707.72; (15).¹
- A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) \$600; (7) \$22.64; (9) \$622.64; (11) \$622.64.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that more or less specifically affects the paint, varnish, and lacquer industry.¹

E. (7) \$15.50; (9) \$15.50.

A. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485), and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water- and land-conservation measures.¹

D. (6) \$11,962.25.

E. (2) \$6,354.68; (4) \$2,661.30; (5) \$2,022.12; (6) \$302.17; (7) \$1,309.42; (8) \$93.75; (9) \$12,743.44; (15).¹

A. National Renderers Association, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation which would specifically have an effect upon the production, consumption, import, export, or taxation of any animal or vegetable fat or oil as well as all legislation generally affecting business, particularly small business.

D. (6) \$16,200.

E. (2) \$643.90; (4) \$103.42; (5) \$109.36; (6) \$145.19; (7) \$327.40; (8) \$41; (9) \$1,370.27.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; postal legislation; Moody-Dingell bill; H. R. 5767 and H. R. 6925, fair-trade legislation; H. R. 6802 and S. 2713, transportation; H. R. 7256, H. R. 7257, H. R. 7258, and S. 2918; appropriation bills including funds for distributive education; H. R. 5505, Customs Simplifications Act; S. Res. 169 and H. R. 5189, consumer research; H. R. 6160, wage and hour. (3).¹

E. (2) \$2,500; (4) \$2,406.45; (5) \$517.60; (6) \$15.54; (7) \$241.30; (8) \$2.50; (9) \$5,683.39; (15).¹

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Renewal of Defense Production Act; retention of Herlong amendment; discontinuance of consumer credit control authority.

E. (2) \$500; (4) \$300; (5) \$400; (6) \$200; (9) \$1,400.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, 440 Downing Avenue, Fort Wayne, Ind.

C. (2) Forand bill, H. R. 2764.

D. (6) \$970.76.

E. (4) \$15.46; (6) \$6.10; (7) \$859.55; (8) \$89.70; (9) \$970.76.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor development, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) \$11,747.

E. (1) \$81.25; (2) \$2,339.73; (3) \$20; (4) \$98.43; (5) \$92.85; (6) \$82.86; (7) \$1,925.33; (8) \$1,067.70; (9) \$5,108.15; (15) \$10, American Association of Port Authorities, 912 Eleventh Street NW., Washington 1, D. C.; dues; \$79.61, The C. & P. Telephone Co., 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; \$289.40, collector of internal revenue, Baltimore 2, Md., withholding tax; \$25, Coyle Lines, Inc., Post Office Box 6058, Station A, New Orleans 14, La., refund of duplicate pay-

ment; \$70.80, Gina's, 1417 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C., stationery; etc.¹

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation which will further the country's rural electrification program, resulting from the REA Act, as amended, including REA administrative and loan funds for rural electrification and for rural telephone; funds for the construction of multipurpose dams, funds for the transmission and related facilities to deliver Federal hydro power to rural electric load centers; proposed legislation providing for surveys and development of water resources. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.

D. (6) \$9,610.37.

E. (1) \$1,274.18; (2) \$2,623.10; (4) \$1,401.45; (5) \$341.49; (6) \$157.14; (7) \$561.96; (8) \$180; (9) \$6,539.32; (15) \$2,213.82, Collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., office overhead; \$64.64, District Unemployment Compensation Board, Washington, D. C., office overhead; \$35.50, Dupont Paint and Hardware, Washington, D. C., office overhead; \$900.78, D. C. Engraving Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., public relations and engraving; \$304.98, John H. Denton, Huntingdon, Pa., travel, food and lodging; \$508.10, Clyde T. Ellis, Washington, D. C., travel, food and lodging; etc.¹

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; House Joint Resolution 337 (opposed).

D. (6) \$16,475.

E. (1) \$125; (2) \$4,862.32; (4) \$7,870.87; (5) \$672.57; (6) \$794.16; (7) \$1,318; (8) \$90.80; (9) \$15,738.94; (15).¹

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing; oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry.

D. (6) \$175,553.54.

E. (1) \$2,500; (4) \$328.42; (9) \$2,828.42; (15) \$2,500, Oscar R. Kreutz, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C., salary; \$307.72, Batt, Bates and Co., Washington, D. C., printing.

A. National Small Businessmen's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$5,000.

E. (1) \$550; (2) \$4,517.50; (5) \$1,441.06; (6) \$88.02; (7) \$110.75; (8) \$10.17; (9) \$6,717.50; (15) \$18.75, Accurate Answering, Washington, D. C., office expense; \$73.48, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone; \$110.75, Chicago & Northwestern Ry. Co., Chicago, Ill., travel; \$39.78, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C.; \$169.85, K. Blyth Emmons, Washington, D. C.; \$550, K. Blyth Emmons, Washington, D. C., publicity; etc.¹

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income-tax legislation.

D. (6) \$20,471.55.

E. (1) \$4,116.55; (2) \$4,554.81; (4) \$2,615.77; (5) \$654.64; (6) \$2,052.38; (7) \$2,758.08; (9) \$16,752.23; (15) \$23.39, Railway Express Agency, 817 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill., express charges; \$533.16, Joseph F.

Leopold, 936 National City Building, Dallas, Tex., fee and expense; \$3,990.50, Standard Printing & Letter Service, 517 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., printing; \$25.10, Western Union, 427 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., telegrams; \$189.24, Monsen-Chicago, Inc., 22 East Illinois Street, Chicago, Ill., express charges; etc.¹

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.

C. (2) Tax limitation.

D. (6) \$2,050.

E. (2) \$375; (5) \$500; (7) \$1,175; (9) \$2,050.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$4,553.61.

F. (2) \$1,250; (5) \$474.67; (7) \$178.90; (8) \$5.88; (9) \$1,909.45; (15) Elizabeth A. Smart, salary, \$725; Alice Haffey, salary, \$525; Methodist Building, rent, \$280; Mrs. D. L. Colvin, travel, \$178.90; office expense, telephone, telegraph, postage, etc., \$194.67.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) S. 1149, reorganization of Department of Agriculture; S. 2549, special sheep-herder bill; H. R. 5678, McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill; H. R. 5505, customs simplification bill; extension of Defense Production Act; agricultural appropriation bills.

D. (6) \$170.

E. (2) \$2,500.02; (6) \$222.13; (7) \$1,714.49; (8) \$1,056.60; (9) \$5,493.24; (15) \$2,500.02, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah; \$977.06, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah; \$1,191.16, J. B. Wilson, McKinley, Wyo.; \$825, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo.

A. William S. Neal, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Reduction of Federal expenditures, revision of tax laws, maintenance of labor regulatory laws, protection of patent system, maintenance of antitrust laws, opposition to wage and price controls and allocations beyond those necessary for defense.

D. (6) \$4,487.13.

E. (9) \$737.13.

A. Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

C. (2) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

D. (6) \$200.

E. (9) \$153.09.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry.

D. (6) \$5,424.68.

E. (2) \$258.48; (4) \$89.61; (5) \$899.74; (6) \$441.89; (7) \$110; (9) \$1,799.72

A. C. Roger Nelson, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Dr. Walter Duschinsky, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).

E. (9) \$1.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. G. W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

D. (6) \$900.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) \$2,926.72.

E. (6) \$12.30; (7) \$1,664.42; (9) \$1,676.72; (15)¹

A. Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.

B. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.

C. (2) Removal of exemptions granted by section 101 of Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) \$375.

A. Harold F. Neumann, 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.

B. New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.

C. (2) Any laws or proposals adversely affecting business.

E. (4) \$37.50; (5) \$25; (6) \$32.49; (9) \$94.99.

A. New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.

C. (2) Any laws or proposals adversely affecting business.

D. (6) \$510.

E. (4) \$37.50; (5) \$25; (6) \$32.49; (8) \$355; (9) \$449.99; (15) \$94.99, Harold F. Neumann, Jersey City, N. J., telephone, telegrams, postage, and stenographer; \$355, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., Washington, D. C., dues.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) \$1,170.

E. (7) \$195; (9) \$195.

A. W. R. Noble, suite 509, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 207 Hotel DeSoto Building, St. Louis, Mo., and National Retail Hardware

Association, 964 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) All labor legislation, tax bills, the Defense Production Act, and all legislation affecting the retail farm equipment and hardware trade. (3) Farm Equipment Retailing and Hardware Retailer.

D. (6) \$3,375.

E. (6) \$158.88; (7) \$402.06; (8) \$156.08; (9) \$717.02.

A. J. S. Noffsinger, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools.

A. Christian P. Norgord, 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mel Morse, president, American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that might affect members as going electric utilities.¹

D. (6) \$4,437.52.

E. (6) \$1.85; (7) \$166.60; (8) \$15; (9) \$183.45; (15) \$15, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues.

A. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

D. (6) \$3,100.

E. (2) \$2,570.24; (9) \$2,570.24; (15) \$2,570.24, Fred J. Fredrickson, Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses.

A. Harry E. Northam, 360 North Michigan Avenue., Chicago, Ill.

B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All matters concerning the practice of medicine and surgery.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan; taxation, forestry, and labor management relations.

A. T. C. Nugent, 1111 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.

B. The California Co., 1111 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.

C. (2) Legislation, regulation, or order affecting the lands of the United States and the procedures by which exploration and production of oil and gas are to be accomplished; interested in the enactment of any law or resolution that will authorize the development of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf.

D. (6) \$1,200.

E. (6) \$60; (7) \$955; (9) \$1,015.

A. Peter Q. Nyce, 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to land of the United States.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 27, to provide a national health insurance and public-health program; H. R. 54, to provide a program of national health insurance and public health; S. 2639 and H. R. 6525, to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; H. R. 5594, to provide benefits for survivors of members of the uniformed services.

D. (6) \$31,070.12.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General interest in proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry.

E. (6) \$5.12; (8) \$5; (9) \$10.12.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled by this company.

E. (4) \$199.85; (5) \$19.49; (6) \$76.75; (7) \$38; (8) \$39.85; (9) \$373.94; (15)¹

A. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.

E. (7) \$417.66; (9) \$417.66; (15) \$417.66, E. C. Shively, reimbursement for travel, food, lodging, and entertainment.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Railroad Security Owners Association, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks or railroad security owners have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, re-education, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities, with particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agriculture development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies, and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services, etc. (3) The American Legion magazine and legislative bulletin.

D. (6) \$1,929.24.

E. (7) \$17.05; (9) \$17.05.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Market Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to public power.

D. (6) \$1,875.

E. (7) \$160; (8) \$60; (9) \$160.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

E. (2) \$2,125; (5) \$1,042.52; (6) \$60.39; (9) \$3,227.91; (15) \$2,125, W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., services.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, post office box 381, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are in part but not exclusively exemplified by bills which in the Digest of Public General Bills, Library of Congress, are indexed under "Public officers and employees," "Retirement," and "Income-tax exemptions"; considerable attention has been paid to bills S. 995, on retirement, and S. 1019, dealing with the Federal-State cooperative program, and Senate hearings on general retirement legislation.

D. (6) \$207.87.

E. (2) \$125; (4) \$20.39; (6) \$1; (9) \$146.39; (15) \$20.39, the Trades Unionist, 729 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C., addressing and mailing newsletters; \$110, Frederick V. Rand, 54 Nash Place, Kensington, Md., services; \$15, Lila W. Meyer, Route 1, Box 632, Annandale, Va., services.

A. Thomas R. Owens, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) \$1,430.

E. (7) \$546; (9) \$546.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Better laws for maternal and child health and welfare.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including, without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.

D. (6) \$200.

E. (2) \$900; (9) \$900.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association, National Council of Coal Lessors, and Television

Broadcasters' Tax Committee, all of Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the bituminous-coal industry and the television broadcasting industry.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. George F. Parrish, 706 Security Building, Charleston, W. Va.

B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.

D. (5) \$3,249.99.

A. James G. Patton, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

B. Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

B. International Minerals & Chemical Corp., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) To amend section 34 of Trading With the Enemy Act to protect interests of domestic corporations owning stock in enemy corporations assets of which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) \$2,500.

E. (6) 45 cents; (7) \$276.52; (8) \$29.90; (9) \$306.87; (15) \$25, January 2, 1952, Washington Board of Trade, 1101 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C., dues.

A. Merl B. Peek, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (a) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485), and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto. All other statutes relating to water- and land-conservation measures. (b) H. R. 5097, H. R. 5368, H. R. 5403, H. R. 5738, H. R. 5630, H. R. 5489; H. R. 5735, H. R. 6804, H. R. 2470, H. R. 4268, H. R. 5743, H. R. 6591, S. 1789, S. 2709, S. 1798, S. 2809, S. 2863, and all other bills concerning reclamation, flood control as related to reclamation, water and land conservation.

D. (6) \$633.33.

E. (7) \$285.05; (9) \$285.05; (11) \$285.05.

A. Ernest L. Peterson, 164 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Minneapolis Traffic Association, 164 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) All legislation directly affecting air, rail, truck, barge, or other forms of transportation.

D. (6) \$633.33.

E. (7) \$285.05; (9) \$285.05; (11) \$285.05.

A. Hugh Peterson, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation referring to the cane sugar refining industry.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, postoffice box 2097, Dixiland Station, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Alaska Statehood Committee, Juneau, Alaska.

C. (2) Statehood for Alaska, S. 50, for the bill.

D. (6) \$1,500.

E. (6) \$7.70; (7) \$347.02; (8) \$2.57; (9) \$357.29; (12) \$356.12; (15) \$96.43, February 3, 1952, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Lake-

land, Fla.; \$17.65, February 10, 1952, Washington Terminal Co., Washington, D. C.; \$96.43, February 17, 1952, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Lakeland, Fla.; \$17.65, March 11, 1952, Washington Terminal Co., Washington, D. C.; \$17.50, February 9, 1952, George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, postoffice box 2097, Dixiland Station, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Government of Guam, Agana, Guam, M. I.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of Guam.

D. (6) \$2,500.

E. (5) \$8.50; (6) \$8.14; (7) \$108.04; (8) \$7.50; (9) \$132.18; (15) \$57.04, January 12, 1952, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Lakeland, Fla.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, postoffice box 2097, Dixiland Station, Lakeland, Fla.

B. U. S. Airlines, Inc., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) For legislation favorably affecting freight air carrier and against legislation that would adversely affect them. For certain amendments to S. 436 and other bills separating mail subsidy so as to allow freight air carriers to carry mail.

D. (6) \$416.66.

E. (6) \$11.88; (7) \$133.85; (8) \$2.98; (9) \$148.71; (12) \$148.71; (15) \$96.44, March 25, 1952, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Lakeland, Fla.; \$17.65, March 27, 1952, Capitol Ticket Office, Washington, D. C.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (The Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.).

D. (6) \$1,986.50.

E. (7) \$31.20; (9) \$31.20; (11) \$31.20; (15) \$14, February 20-21, 1952, Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D. C., hotel room; \$37.20, February 20-21, 1952, transportation, taxicabs, food, etc., in various restaurants.

A. Pierson & Ball, 1007 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

C. (2) Excess-profits tax bills.

A. Pierson & Ball, 1007 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Radio Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Excess-profits tax and excise-tax bills.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 483 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.

D. (6) \$52.50.

A. Frank M. Porter, 150 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) (See explanatory statement.)¹

A. James E. Poulton, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
 D. (6) \$1,062.54.
 E. (7) \$6.10; (9) \$6.10; (11) \$6.10.
- A. Kenneth L. Pray, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.
- A. William H. Press, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
 D. (6) \$3,712.50.
- A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
 B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
- A. William M. Price, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of Canal Zone Trade Unions, Balboa, C. Z.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting employees on the Canal Zone.
 D. (6) \$1,200.
 E. (2) \$250; (3) \$110; (5) \$145; (6) \$50; (7) \$1,160; (8) \$85; (9) \$1,800.
- A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York City.
 C. (2) In support of Federal Savings and Loan Association branch, bills S. 2517 and S. 2564.
 D. (6) \$154.25.
 E. (7) \$10.25; (9) \$10.25; (11) \$10.25.
- A. The Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Measures affecting proprietary medicines industry. Fair-trade bills.
 E. (4) \$136.80; (7) \$100; (9) \$236.80; (15) \$100, first quarter, A. K. Barta (miscellaneous) 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
- A. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
 C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
 E. (2) \$2,750; (6) \$28.81; (9) \$2,778.81; (15) \$2,778.21, January 9, 1952, Milo J. Warner, Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.
- A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Dr. Walter Duschinsky, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).
 E. (8) \$1; (9) \$1.
- A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 C. (2) General legislative interests of clients are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
 D. (6) \$250.
 E. (9) \$6.40.
- A. Alexander Purdon, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) General legislative interests are concerned with the declaration of policy as expressed by the Congress in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and such other legislation as may affect the development of an adequate merchant marine.
 D. (6) \$406.25.
 E. (7) \$67.59; (9) \$67.59; (11) \$67.59.
- A. Edmund R. Purves, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession. H. R. 4914, military construction bill, support of section 504. Defense housing bill, S. 349, general support but criticizing certain aspects. H. R. 1901, Nevius tract, protesting against this. S. 898, reorganization of national park and planning, against this as it is presently proposed. S. 2645 and S. 2584, Defense Production Act continuation, in support. S. 2137 and H. R. 6598, lease purchase of public buildings, in support. S. 2487, to extend judicial review of administrative decisions in support. H. R. 4371 (Keogh), H. R. 4373 (Reed), individual retirement, in support. H. R. 1171 (Davis), tax adjustment, in support.
 D. (6) \$200.
- A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
 B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
 C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.
- A. Ward L. Quaal, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), suite 532, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) CCBS will oppose any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class I-A clear-channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I-A standard broadcast stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950. (See 1 above).
 D. (6) (See page 3).
 E. (7) \$558.01; (9) \$558.01.
- A. Earl Quale and Arno Wisness, Watford City, N. Dak.
 B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak., trustees on behalf of former owners of lands sold to United States seeking recovery of mineral rights.
 C. (2) Will be interested in a bill seeking the recovery of right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States.
 E. (8) \$282; (9) \$282.
- A. Frank Quigley, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$7,500.
 E. (7) \$917.61; (9) \$917.61; (15) \$95.39, December 7, 1951, Eastern Airlines, Washington to Houston, Tex.; \$66.42, December 9-14, 1951, Braniff Airlines, Houston to Dallas to Austin to Dallas to Houston, Tex.; \$23, December 15, 1951, Eastern Airlines, Houston, Tex., to New Orleans, La.; \$51.75, December 17, 1951, New Orleans, La., to Miami, Fla.; \$12.50, November 20 to December 19, 1951, Stanley Peeles Motors Co., car storage; \$36.36, December 13, 1951, Nichols Bros. Garage & Auto Parking Co., Dallas, Tex., use of car, all for transportation, for telephone business purposes.
- A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City, United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 50 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York City, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.
 C. (2) Public health.
 D. (6) \$6,874.98.
 E. (2) \$2,044.85; (5) \$348.19; (6) \$140.97; (7) \$1,020.82; (9) \$3,554.83; (11) \$3,554.83.
- A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).
 D. (6) \$1,675.
- A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.
 D. (6) \$2,250.
- A. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry.
 E. (2) \$3,495; (8) \$75.93; (9) \$3,570.93; (11) \$3,570.93.
- A. Leon Raesly, suite 624, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) S. 1671 and S. 1672.
- A. Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. box 798, New Haven, Conn.
 C. (2) For enactment of H. R. 63 and S. 1398—30-year half-pay retirement. For enactment of H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 amended to be payable from first of sickness.
 D. (6) \$427.90.
 E. (4) \$91.67; (5) 28.77; (7) 548.60; (8) \$5.78; (9) \$174.82; (11) \$174.82.
- A. Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
- A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
- A. Alan T. Rains, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry. No specific bills at this time.
- A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation involving silver H. R. 1321—To repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
 D. (6) \$4,250.06.
 E. (7) \$359.86; (9) \$859.86.
- A. Frederick V. Rand, 54 Nash Place, Kensington, Md.
 B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, P. O. box 381, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$110.
- A. Jacob Reck, 1346 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Beauty & Barber Manufacturers' Association, 1346 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$2,100.
 E. (8) \$9.50; (9) \$9.50.
- A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
 B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Social security. (3) The Advisor.
 D. (6) \$4,999.98.
- A. Otle M. Reed, Wyatt Building, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
 C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers and dairy product manufacturing concerns.
 D. (6) \$1,000.
 E. (2) \$1,000; (4) \$170.77; (5) \$100; (7) \$237.31; (9) \$1,508.08.
- A. Otle M. Reed, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
 D. (6) \$1,181.25.
- A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. Specific interests: S. 2358, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; S. 2361, a bill to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers; S. 2362, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain operations of private carriers by motor vehicle, and to restrict the leasing of vehicles. Position: Generally in opposition to all three, but favorable to amendments thereof. (3) (See p. 3 attached.)¹
- E. (2) \$2,698.75; (4) \$853.35; (5) \$25; (6) \$28.25; (7) \$399.66; (8) \$55.42; (9) \$4,060.43; (15).¹
- A. Gerard D. Reilly, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Printing Industry of America, Inc., et al. (See preliminary report.)¹
 C. (2) Opposing legislation directed against provisions in Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, relating to supervisors.
 D. (7) \$916.66.
- A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
 D. (6) \$408.33 (see schedule attached.)¹
 E. (7) \$13.75; (9) \$13.75.
- A. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits and pensions; study and analyzing bills; preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees and drafting amendments where indicated; appearing before committees of Congress, principally the Committees on Armed Services, Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved.
 (3) The Retired Officer.
 D. (6) \$18,781.05.
- A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
 C. (1) Legislative interests are expected to continue indefinitely. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.¹
 D. (6) \$4,616.20.
 E. (2) \$2,640.58; (4) \$417.50; (5) \$569.05; (6) \$58.57; (8) \$668.75; (9) \$4,354.45; (15) \$117.50, January 3 and March 20, Shepherd Printing Co., 110 High Street, Portsmouth, Va., printing membership cards and stamps and Christmas cards; \$58.57, January 3, January 28, February 29, and March 28, the C. & P. Telephone Co., post office box 2601, Washington, D. C., telephone and telegraph service; \$134.05, January 3, February 1, and March 3, Commercial Office Furniture Co., 915 E Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; \$154.41, March 10, Collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding and social security taxes, etc.¹
- A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security; (3) The Reserve Officer and ROA Washington Newsletter.
- A. Roland Rice, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
- C. (2) S. 2358, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; S. 2361, a bill to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers; S. 2362, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain operations of private carriers by motor vehicle, and to restrict the leasing of vehicles. Position: Generally in opposition to all three, but favorable to amendments thereof. (3) (See attachment A.)¹
 D. (6) \$825.
 E. (7) \$6; (9) \$6.
- A. Charles R. Richey, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
 D. (6) \$1,875.
 E. (7) \$159.30; (9) \$159.30; (15) February 18, \$18, Hoover Commission Dinner.
- A. Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any specific legislation that may relate to margarine. Also interested in passage of H. R. 3207, Eighty-second Congress, first session, to amend Navy ration statute (34 U. S. C. 902a). Also interested in passage of H. R. 5012, which is likewise designed to amend the Navy ration statute.
 D. (6) \$50 (see p. 3, attached.)¹
 E. (7) \$6; (9) \$6.
- A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
 D. (6) \$2,364.
 E. (2) \$2,364; (6) \$22.40; (8) \$227.60; (9) \$2,614.
- A. Frank W. Rogers, 911 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
 C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.
 D. (6) \$3,000.
 E. (4) \$60; (7) \$268; (9) \$328; (15) \$60, Phyllis Loren, National Press Building, stenographic service; \$18, Statler Hotel, Washington, dinner; \$140, Statler Hotel, Washington, dinner \$110, Statler Hotel, Washington, dinner.
- A. Dr. Frederick E. Robin, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (see attachment A.)¹
 C. (2) National health plan as embodied in H. R. 27 and H. R. 54. Also interested in the following measures: S. 445, S. 337, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 14, H. R. 149, H. R. 342, H. R. 146. (3) (See attachment B.)¹
 D. (6) \$2,374.98.
 E. (7) \$61.49; (9) \$61.49; (11) \$61.49.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Philip L. Rizzo, 826 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. The Consumers' Lobby, 826 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation directly affecting the consumer interest such as price-control provision in Defense Production Act (for), fair trade (against), and S. R. 169 (for).

E. (6) \$7; (7) \$250; (8) \$20; (9) \$277; (11) \$277.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Beet Growers' Association, P. O. Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.

C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of American farmers to grow and market sugar beets.

D. (6) \$520.

E. (2) \$30; (4) \$46.60; (5) \$80; (6) \$1.21; (7) \$334.16; (9) \$491.97; (15) \$30, Mrs. Ann Glass, Washington, D. C., secretary and collector internal revenue, Baltimore, Md.; \$46.60, postmaster, Washington, D. C., Elliott Addressing Machine Co., Washington, D. C.; \$80, Mrs. Miriam Keller, Simpsonville, Md., E. W. Rising, Washington, D. C.; \$1.21, Western Union, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; \$334.16, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., E. W. Rising, meals, cab fares, and miscellaneous, Northwest and American Air Lines.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite No. 3, Washington, D. C.

B. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources.

E. (2) \$379.01; (4) \$123.56; (5) \$165; (6) \$21.87; (9) \$689.44; (15) \$379.01, Ann Glass, Washington, D. C., stenographic and collector of internal revenue, Baltimore, Md.; \$123.56, Kirby Lithograph Co., Washington, D. C., Postmaster, Washington, D. C., Elliott Addressograph Machine Co., Washington, D. C., Gist & Chairs, Washington, D. C., supplies, R. P. Andrews Co., Washington, D. C., envelopes, United States Government Printing Office, reprints; \$165, Mrs. Miriam Keller, Simpsonville, Md., E. W. Rising, Washington, D. C.; \$21.87, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

A. George B. Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2907. Qualified contractor.

D.¹

E.¹

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting interests of wholesale grocers. (a) Fair-trade bills, transportation amendments to Interstate Commerce Act, amendments to Fair Labor Standards Act, (b) H. R. 5767, H. R. 6925, S. 2361, S. 2362, S. 2298, H. R. 5769, H. R. 5775, H. R. 5776. (c) Miller-Tydings Act, Federal Trade Commission Act, Clayton Act, Sherman Act, Interstate Commerce Act, Fair Labor Standards Act. (d) For H. R. 5767; against all other bills cited.

A. John Forney Rudy, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) \$450.

E. (7) \$168.85; (9) \$168.85; (14) \$168.85.

A. Edward A. Rumely, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$10,175.

A. Charles J. Rush, 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) \$1,650.

E. (7) \$364; (9) \$364.

A. Francis M. Russell, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (7) \$238.25; (9) \$238.25; (15) \$238.25; (16) \$47.50, January 8, 1952, Carlton Hotel; \$58.75, January 12, 1952, Shoreham Hotel; \$86, February 28, 1952, Metropolitan Club; \$46, March 21, 1952, Mayflower Hotel.

A. Horace Russell, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.

D. (6) \$2,750.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.

D. (6) \$3,750.

E. (7) \$256.80; (9) \$256.80; (15)¹

A. William Henry Ryan, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. District No. 44, I. A. of M., Room 303 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.

D. (6) \$1,499.94.

E. (7) \$15; (9) \$15.

A. Sterling St. John, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 998, 1001), as amended, to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes. In opposition to H. R. 5305 (82d Cong.), to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 in order to extend foreign-trade zone privileges to certain types of warehouses.

D. (6) \$66.96.

E. (4) \$56.55; (7) \$688.48; (8) \$5.50; (9) \$750.53; (15)¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) S. 2504, S. 2325; H. Res. 532.

D. (6) \$5.

E. (6) \$5; (9) \$5.

A. Benjamin F. Saltzstein, 625 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

B. Hedwig Lydia Riedner, Astor Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis.

C. (2) S. 302; H. R. 1620, and H. R. 2656; amendments to Public Law 859, Eighty-first Congress.

E. (4) \$5.71; (6) \$26.99; (7) \$28.95; (9) \$61.65; (15) February, C. & P. Telephone Co., \$19.25.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue (eleventh floor), New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates, particularly Public Law No. 233.

D. (6) \$1,500.

E. (6) \$55.42; (7) \$1; (9) \$56.42; (15) January, C. & P. Telephone Co., \$35.62; February, C. & P. Telephone Co., \$15.11.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Benjamin F. Saltzstein, 625 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

C. (2) S. 302; H. R. 1620 and H. R. 2656; amendments to Public Law 859, Eighty-first Congress.

E. (4) \$5.71; (6) \$26.99; (7) \$28.95; (9) \$61.65; (15) February, C. & P. Telephone Co., \$19.25.

A. Chas. E. Sands, 4211 Second Street, Washington, D. C.

B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) Labor and social legislation.

E. (5) \$102; (6) \$24; (9) \$126.

A. L. R. Sanford, Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.

C. (2) Seeking amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950; H. R. 9827, Eighty-first Congress, second session, Public Law 909.

E. (2) \$3,000; (9) \$3,000.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General legislative interests are in legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. Specific legislative interests include support of H. R. 910 (a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants and scholarships for nursing education); and support of H. R. 911 and S. 661 (a bill to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force). (3) The American Journal of Nursing.

D. (6) \$2,100.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

B. Norfolk and Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

C. (2) S. 2226.

E. (7) \$30.75; (9) \$30.75; (15) \$30.75, February 28, 1952, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., food and lodging.

- A. Paul W. Schoen, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (6) \$25; (7) \$20; (9) \$45.
- A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bill to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. H. R. 6525 and S. 2639. For such bill.
E. (6) \$3.94; (9) \$3.94.
- A. Ed D. Schorr, 33 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety.
E. (2) \$4,901; (5) \$3,371.89; (7) \$2,154.96; (8) \$981.83; (9) \$11,359.68; (15) \$65.05, January 12 to March 6, inclusive, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., books and pamphlets; \$124.33, February 12, the Thompson Co., Columbus, Ohio, office supplies; \$101.50, January 12 to March 7, inclusive, Jane Mithoff, Columbus, Ohio, clerical services; \$91, January 15 to March 7, inclusive, Ruth Harmel, Columbus, Ohio, clerical services; \$58.50, January 15, Robert Masters, Columbus, Ohio, clerical services, etc.¹
- A. Mrs. Andrew MacKay Scott, League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (7) \$15.50; (9) \$15.50.
- A. Jack Garrett Scott, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators.
C. (2) S. 1539, S. 2211, H. R. 6536.
- A. John W. Scott, 317 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Harvey B. Jacobson, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3097, S. 17, and S. 1725 (82d Cong.); and H. R. 1566, H. R. 4446, H. R. 8201, and S. 1928 (81st Cong.); bills to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; (2) H. R. 3760 (82d Cong.) and H. R. 9123 (81st Cong.), proposed bills for general revision and codification of patent laws.
D. (6) \$900.
- A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1202—opposed. S. 1318, H. R. 3599, 3560, 3581, 3640, 3747, 3762, 3769, 3805, 3809, 3836, 3848, 3902, 4912, 4748; S. 2452; H. R. 4051; S. 1874—for.
D. (6) \$300.
- A. Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests relate to taxation, Government regulation of business, and other legislation directly affecting business. Specifically interested in legislation affecting businessmen such as H. R. 240.
D. (6) \$2,500.
E. (7) \$48.15; (9) \$48.15.
- A. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.
E. (7) \$17.55; (9) \$17.55.
- A. Selvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.
B. (1) National Association of Retail Grocers, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Food Chains, Washington, D. C. (3) Cooperative Food Distributors of America, Chicago, Ill. (4) Supermarket Institute, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Principals interested in amendments as yet unformulated to Public Law 96, Eighty-second Congress; Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951.
D. (6) \$4,000.
E. (1) \$389.75; (6) \$32; (8) \$139.60; (9) \$561.35.
- A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange.
D. (6) \$2,499.99.
E. (6) \$33.03; (7) \$17.83; (8) \$7.54; (9) \$58.40.
- A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the New York Cotton Exchange.
D. (6) \$3,000.
E. (6) \$4.37; (7) \$31.15; (8) \$3; (9) \$38.52.
- A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting trailer coaches.
D. (6) \$1,249.98.
E. (6) \$30.62; (7) \$66.64; (8) \$14.31; (9) \$111.57.
- A. Harry L. Senger, 1539 Larry Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Retired Teachers' Association.
C. (2) Forand bill, H. R. 2764.
D. (6) \$295.56.
E. (4) \$15.41; (7) \$270.74; (8) \$9.41.
- A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 7268, 1642, 3146, 5099; S. 517, 1963, 2021; H. R. 5743; S. 2812; H. R. 7072, 7176; S. 2594, 2645; H. R. 6546, 6843.
D. (6) \$3,774.99.
- A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia; point 4 program; etc.; favor plans for universal disarmament; favor full cooperation with the U. N. in economic and social welfare, UNICEF; oppose UMT, UMS, and military aid programs; oppose rearming Japan, Germany; other measures related to peace and war. (3) Peace Action.
E. (7) \$60.90; (9) \$60.90.
- A. Leander I. Shelley, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Port of New York Authority, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For S. 2722 (Knowland), to amend Defense Production Act; for S. 2815 (McCaran), to amend Federal Airports Act; for H. R. 4484 (Walter), with respect to submerged lands; against Senate Joint Resolution 20 (O'Mahoney), with respect to submerged lands.
D. (5) \$3,750.
E. (6) \$1.75; (7) \$206.42; (8) \$35; (9) \$243.17; (15) \$17.87, January 11, Hotel Everglades, Miami, Fla., lodging, etc.; \$57.59, January 20-21, March 28, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., New York City, transportation and Pullman; \$10, March 15, The American Association of Port Authorities, dues as associate member; \$25, March 19, Airport Operators' Council, registration fees, annual meeting; \$52.56, March 23, Hollywood Roosevelt Hotel, Hollywood Calif., lodging, etc.
- A. Robert H. Shields, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948, and related legislation.
D. (6) \$10,000.
- A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests. (a) St. Lawrence seaway bills, Senate Joint Resolution 27, House Joint Resolution 337; and railroad unemployment insurance bill, H. R. 6525. (b) Senate Joint Resolution 27, House Joint Resolution 337, and H. R. 6255.
D. (6) \$384.81.
E. (7) \$384.81; (9) \$384.81; (15) February 5, 1952, \$28.78, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Pullman expenses; January 24, 1952, \$179.66, Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., hotel expenses; February 11, 1952, \$40.50, Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., hotel expenses; March 17, 1952, \$126.44, Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., hotel expenses.
- A. Silver Users' Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver, H. R. 1321, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
D. (6) \$33,210.
E. (2) \$6,528.04; (5) \$890.26; (6) \$415.58; (7) \$859.86; (8) \$742.34; (9) \$9,436.08.
- A. Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the Central Arizona project, and House Joint Resolution 21 and Senate Joint Resolution 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions; and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
D. (6) \$10,000.
E. (2) \$5,480; (8) \$421.02; (9) \$5,901.02; (15) \$3,200, February 4, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., retainer and per diem; \$398.27, February 4, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., reimbursement of expenses; \$1,000, February 19, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., retainer and per diem; \$1,280, March 25, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., retainer and per diem; \$22.75, March 25, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., reimbursement of expenses.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. Stephen G. Silpher, room 512, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) (See attached sheets).¹
 D. (6) \$1,150.
 E. (7) \$19.70; (9) \$19.70; (11) \$19.70.

- A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) General: Forestry, regional development, resource conservation, labor relations. Specific: St. Lawrence seaway; Frying-Pan, Arkansas; Dinosaur Monument; dyke marsh; tuna tariff; New England power survey; non-ferrous mining; Forest Service appropriations.
 D. (7) \$126.

- A. George C. Smith, Jr., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) General legislative interests, including the improvement of Government efficiency, elimination of waste, and economy in Government. Specific interests include appropriations bills, bills to enact recommendations of the Hoover Commission, other reorganization proposals, and substantive legislation involving Government expenditures.
 D. (6) \$2,500.
 E. (6) \$5.21; (7) \$279.13; (9) \$284.34.

- A. Harold O. Smith, Jr., 400 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

- A. Lloyd W. Smith, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.
 D. (6) \$2,085.

- A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).¹
 D. (6) \$16,250.01.
 E. (3) \$25; (6) \$10.40; (7) \$228.29; (9) \$263.69; (15).¹

- A. Robert E. Smith, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
 B. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association.
 C. (2) House Joint Resolution 323 for limiting income-tax rates.
 D. (6) \$900.
 E. (7) \$912.85; (9) \$912.85; (12) \$4,785.81; (14) \$8.63.

- A. Calvin K. Snyder, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
 D. (6) \$3,750.
 E. (6) \$4.85; (7) \$626.02; (9) \$630.87; (15) \$42.79, January 27, 1952, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner conference; \$24, January 9, 1952, Duke Zeibert's Restaurant,

- Washington, D. C., dinner conference; \$12, January 25, 1952, Duke Zeibert's Restaurant, dinner conference; \$10.65, February 4, 1952, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner conference; \$23.45, March 11, 1952, Congressional Country Club, Bradbury Hills, Md., dinner conference, etc.¹

- A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
 B. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
 D. (6) \$750.

- A. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
 C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system. (3) Bulletin.
 D. (6) \$48,169.
 E. (2) \$13,995; (4) \$2,654.67; (5) \$1,454.84; (6) \$176.74; (7) \$586.47; (8) \$917.03; (9) \$19,784.75.

- A. Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
 B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc.
 C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

- A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
 B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

- A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Same as first session of Eighty-second Congress with addition of appropriation for Federal school-lunch program in second session of Eighty-second Congress. Also supporting S. 2337, emergency maternal and infant care for servicemen's wives and children, title I.
 D. (6) \$122.
 E. (4) \$36; (5) \$17.80; (6) \$7.35; (7) \$40; (9) \$101.15; (15) \$40, March 10, 1952, Mrs. Edward C. Preble, 22 East Seven Hundred and Fourth Street, Orangeburg, N. Y., expenses paid for trip to Washington to testify on hearing of S. 2337; \$36, March 19, 1952, Elton T. Cowan, 133 West Nineteenth Street, New York, N. Y., reprint of address delivered at annual meeting.

- A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.
 B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) H. R. 166, H. R. 2129, S. 399, H. R. 2423, H. R. 6228, H. R. 2422, S. 510, H. R. 2688, H. R. 2313, H. R. 2343, H. R. 1313, S. 1125, Public Law 234, Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, and all legislation pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act, and to secure additional benefits for the rank and file of railroad employees covered by the Retirement Act. (3) Rail Pension News.
 D. (6) \$1,320.
 E. (1) \$214.50; (2) \$1,320; (4) \$1,400; (6) \$33.40; (7) \$357.50; (9) \$3,325.20.

- A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. Numerous House and Senate bills dealing with the subject of bonding of Federal employees, and bills reactivating War Damage Corporation.

- D. (6) \$150.
 E. (7) \$6.75; (9) \$6.75.

- A. Charles I. Stengle, room 716, AFGE, 700 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.
 D. (6) \$1,384.56.
 E. (7) \$38.40; (9) \$38.40.

- A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
 D. (6) \$3,634.01.
 E. (7) \$259.48; (8) \$74.53; (9) \$334.01; (15) \$15, National Press Club, Press Building, Washington, D. C., dues, first quarter 1952.

- A. Erskine Stewart, suite 808, Kass Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) H. R. 1938, LIFO; H. R. 3622 and other Fair Labor Standards Act amendments; H. R. 5505, Customs Simplification Act; H. R. 6174, S. 2504, and all other unemployment-compensation legislation; S. 2170, cotton labeling; S. 1267, fiber labeling; S. 2594, S. 2645, H. R. 6546, and all other amendments to Defense Production Act; S. 2918, H. R. 7256, H. R. 7257, and H. R. 7258, and all other bills on flammable fabrics; Senate Resolution 169, H. R. 5189, and all other consumer interest proposals; H. R. 5767, H. R. 6367, and other price maintenance legislation; all appropriation legislation; all proposals relating to parcel-post size and weight limitations; S. 106, District of Columbia optometry; S. 2713 and H. R. 6802 and other similar freight proposals.
 E. (7) \$16.20; (8) \$1.25; (9) \$17.45.

- A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
 D. (6) \$2,487.56.
 E. (7) \$15.35; (8) \$47.21; (9) \$62.56; (15) \$15, January 3, 1952, National Press Club, Press Building, Washington, D. C., dues, first quarter, 1952; \$10, February 11, 1952, National Association of Real Estate Editors, Memphis, Tenn., annual dues, 1952.

- A. Benton J. Strong, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
 B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver 5, Colo. (home office), and 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation on matters of interest to the National Farmers Union.
 D. (6) \$2,750.

- A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Waterman Steamship Corp., Sixty-first Street, Mobile, Ala.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American Merchant Marine and transportation generally.
 D. (6) \$1,000.
 E. (7) \$6; (9) \$6.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Oppose S. 1202; for S. 1318, H. R. 3599 and similar bills.¹
 D. (6) \$700.
 E. (7) \$ 25; (9) \$125.
- A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) H. R. 4059, S. Res. 253, H. R. 3711, and S. J. Res. 122.
 D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
 C. (2) H. R. 4059, copyright amendment bill, relative to manufacturing clause, and S. 2444, liquor advertising bill.
 D. (6) \$625.
- A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Labor-Management Council, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$1,624.99.
 E. (7) \$159.49; (9) \$159.49.
- A. William C. Stronach, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 B. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting the practice of medicine and all national health insurance legislation.
- A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.¹
 D. (6) \$625.
 E. (7) \$11; (9) \$11.
- A. J. E. Sturrock, post-office box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
 B. Texas Water Conservation Association, post-office box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
 C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.¹ (3) Texas Water.
 D. (6) \$1,500.
 E. (2) \$46.50; (5) \$39.54; (6) \$19.45; (7) \$1,112.28; (8) \$88.03; (9) \$1,305.80; (15).¹
- A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
 B. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
 C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
- A. Francis W. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semimonthly.
 D. (6) \$2,906.60.
- A. A. D. Sutherland, 104 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.
 B. Bankers Farm Mortgage Co., Fond du Lac, Wis., in behalf of former bondholders of Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wis., and F. A. Carlton, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) For H. R. 6813.
 E. (6) \$7.25; (7) \$22; (8) \$23.45; (9) \$52.70.
- A. William A. Sutherland, 1012 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Lowell Liquidation Corp., Lowell, Mass.
 C. (2) H. R. 3168.
 E. (2) \$500; (4) \$6.12; (6) \$35.94; (8) \$15.55; (9) \$557.61; (15) \$500, Milton Cooper, Washington, D. C., legal services.
- A. James A. Tawney, 504 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting members of the association or their affiliated associations.
 D. (6) \$1,687.50.
- A. Tax Equality Association of Montana, McKay Building, 107 East Main, Missoula, Mont.
 C. (2) Repeal of the exemption contained in sections 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code and all bills so to do which apply to the conduct of business competition with goods and services produced for a livelihood by the citizenry.
 E. (5) \$3.61; (9) \$3.61.
- A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
 C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code.
 D. (6) \$430.
 E. (2) \$521.25; (4) \$23.43; (5) \$210; (8) \$7.84; (9) \$762.52; (15) \$375, Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky., salary; \$146.25, Dorothy Gates, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky., salary; \$210, Kentucky Tax Research Association, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky., joint office expense; \$15.03, postmaster, Louisville, Ky., stamps.
- A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
- A. Hugh W. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
 C. (2) Mutual Security Agency and Department of Agriculture appropriations.
 D. (7) \$2,500.
 E. (8) \$152.88; (9) \$45.42; (10) \$198.30.
- A. John Thomas Taylor, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) The general program of the American Legion as outlined by their national convention and executive committee as it affects veterans and their dependents and allied and kindred subjects dealing with our national security.
 D. (6) \$2,400.60.
 E. (7) \$720.30; (9) \$720.30.
- A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Coops and Legislative Letter.
 D. (6) \$2,365.35.
 E. (8) \$2.85; (9) \$2.85.
- A. Tyre Taylor, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
 C. (2) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free enterprise system.
 D. (6) \$2,156.28.
 E. (5) \$486; (6) \$65.10; (9) \$551.10.
- A. Donald Teel, 1516 Olds Tower, Lansing, Mich.
 B. Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower, Lansing, Mich.
 C. (2) In favor of legislation designed to have all business corporations taxed in the same manner and on the same basis.
- A. Television Broadcasters' Tax Committee, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$2,000.
 E. (2) \$1,572; (4) \$98.96; (7) \$1,684.10; (9) \$3,355.06; (15) \$72, The Fort Industry Co., 199 Pierce Street, Birmingham, Mich., typing service; \$53.05, the Litho Press, Miami Beach, Fla., printing; \$500, Lovell H. Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., services, etc.¹
- A. Marjorie L. Temple, 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., are those which affect favorably or adversely the interests of women in business and the professions. (3) The Independent Woman.
 D. (6) \$26,474.40.
 E. (2) \$875; (4) \$125; (5) \$240.78; (6) \$74.28; (8) \$24.08; (9) \$1,339.14; (15) \$125, National Printing Co., Third and N Streets NE., Washington, D. C., printing.
- A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West Fifteenth Street (post-office box 2084, Capitol Station), Austin, Tex.
 C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. (3) Texas Water.
 D. (6) \$4,599.61.
 E. (2) \$1,767.91; (3) \$233; (4) \$831.14; (5) \$246.12; (6) \$127.07; (7) \$1,028.78; (8) \$1,121.69; (9) \$5,355.71; (15) \$225, C. S. Heacock, Austin, Tex., office rent; \$1,028.78, J. E. Sturrock, Austin, Tex., traveling expenses; \$233, National Reclamation Association, Washington, D. C., contribution; \$66.60, collector of internal revenue, Austin, Tex., social security and income tax withheld from salaries; \$1,205.05, J. E. Sturrock, Austin, Tex., salary; etc.¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. Whitney Tharin, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Potato Council, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
- A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
C. (2) All Senate and House bills and resolutions affecting the interests of Nevada railroads.
D. (6) \$675.
- A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation.¹
D. (6) \$6,166.66.
E. (7) \$103.75; (9) \$103.75.
- A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 468 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.¹
D. (6) \$2,016.67.
E. (7) \$74.84; (9) \$74.84.
- A. Arthur P. Tiernan, 201 Southeast Third Street, Evansville, Ind.
B. Vanderburgh County Medical Society, 201 Southeast Third Street, Evansville, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.
- A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of H. R. 5715, H. R. 5603, H. R. 5996.
D. (6) \$2,500.
E. (7) \$18.75; (9) \$18.75.
- A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.
- A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
D. (6) \$1,902.42.
E. (9) \$141.25.
- A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry.¹
D. (6) \$1,831.73.
E. (7) \$38.50; (9) \$38.50.
- A. Fred A. Tobin, 438 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$3,750.
- A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) \$2,224.92.
E. (8) \$46.20; (9) \$46.20.
- A. John H. Todd, 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton-compress and cotton-warehouse industry.
D. (6) \$312.50.
E. (5) \$2.59; (6) \$8.35; (9) \$10.94.
- A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Interest has been in the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration in the Department of the Interior appropriation.
D. (6) \$5,600.
- A. Matt Triggs, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; repeal of resale price maintenance; immigration legislation; Mexican farm-labor importation; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; St. Lawrence seaway; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; control and eradication of brucellosis; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service; universal military training; fair-trade pricing study.
D. (6) \$1,687.50.
E. (7) \$65.98; (9) \$65.98.
- A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry.
- A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Ore.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Ore.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.
D. (6) \$229.12.
E. (9) \$9.42.
- A. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The organization is interested in the over-all field of social security. (3) The Advisor.
D. (6) \$42,400.
E. (2) \$10,774.98; (3) \$60; (4) \$2,049.96; (5) \$4,813.82; (6) \$496.52; (7) \$2,427.50; (8) \$1,346.08; (9) \$21,968.86; (15) \$75.07, R. P. Andrews Paper Co., Washington, D. C., office supplies; \$1,917.74, Bates Duplicating, 729 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C., printing; \$423.57, Capital Airlines, Washington,
- D. C., transportation; \$25.12, Chamber of Commerce of United States, Washington, D. C., fee; \$496.52, C. & P. Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone and telegraph, etc.¹
- A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 50 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) \$999.99; (7) \$37.73; (9) \$1,087.72.
- A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
- A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are all statutes and bills affecting the importation by the United States of sugar from Cuba, and the tariff rates on such sugar, and those statutes and bills affecting trade between the United States and Cuba, particularly trade in sugar. (3)¹
D. (6) \$31,775.
E. (1) \$7,935.33; (4) \$1,336.94; (9) \$9,272.27; (15) \$1,336.94, J. C. Dillon Co., 227 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y., printing; \$7,935.33, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., fee.
- A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions. (3)¹
E. (2) \$4,040.88; (4) \$5,809.26; (5) \$700.18; (6) \$181.02; (7) \$117.68; (8) \$367.88; (9) \$11,216.90; (15)¹
- A. United States Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation, etc., for higher tariffs and import quotas for screws, nuts, rivets, and similar fasteners.
- A. Albert F. Versen, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Missouri Valley Chapter Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
- A. Albert F. Versen, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
- A. A. L. Viles, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
- A. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
C. (2) All legislation affecting tax equality which is favored by this association.
D. (6) \$5,584.50.
E. (2) \$1,500; (4) \$426.77; (5) \$750; (7) \$183.27; (8) \$56.63; (9) \$2,916.67; (15) \$2,250, Walter M. Evans, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va., salary and expenses; \$10.50, Spencer Printing Co., 5 South Fifteenth Street, Richmond, Va., printing; \$74.05, Keel-Williams Corp., 10 North Fourteenth Street, Richmond, Va., salary and expenses; \$10.50, tiser's Letter Shop, 809 East Franklin Street, Richmond, Va., reproducing and mailing circulars, bulletins, and letters, etc.¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

- A. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
- A. Tracy S. Voorhees, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 7005, a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951.
- A. Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.
- A. James A. Waggner, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.
- A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that might affect association members as going electric utilities.¹
D. (6) \$7,062.52.
E. (6) \$25.15; (7) \$457.97; (8) \$40.70; (9) \$523.82.
- A. Thomas G. Walters, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, A. F. of L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and the Government Employees Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.
D. (6) \$2,277.
- A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.
D. (6) \$2,750.
E. (6) \$28.81; (9) \$28.81.
- A. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
- A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.
E. (3) \$500; (9) \$500.
- A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.¹
- A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.
- A. Newton Patrick Weathersby, Room 303 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Supporting or opposing as the case may be legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) \$1,999.98.
E. (7) \$25; (9) \$25.
- A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor development, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) \$2,979.20.
E. (3) \$5; (5) \$11.35; (6) \$18.09; (7) \$450.73; (8) \$211.68; (9) \$696.85; (15).¹
- A. Wayne Weishaar,² 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting aviation training or contract overhaul of aircraft which may arise at any time in future.
D. (6) \$3,300.
E. (3) \$6; (7) \$3.90; (8) \$1.25; (9) \$11.15.
- A. W. S. Weismann, Jr., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting air transportation.
D. (6) \$2,750.
E. (7) \$135; (9) \$135.
- A. Bernard Weitzer, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support legislation to carry out the purpose of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in preamble to its constitution and to oppose legislation which would tend to frustrate the purpose expressed.
D. (7) \$2,999.96.
E. (5) \$104.69; (6) \$11.37; (7) \$236.80; (8) \$16.12; (9) \$368.98; (15) \$256.48.
- A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,350.
- A. William E. Welsh, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485), and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water and land-conservation measures.
D. (6) \$3,249.99.
E. (7) \$512.87; (9) \$512.87.
- A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, suite 906-907, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat-packing industry.
D. (6) \$54,566.13.
E. (7) \$45; (8) \$38.01; (9) \$83.01; (15) \$38.01, Batt, Bates & Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., mimeographing; \$31, Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon.
- A. Edward K. Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shore Line Oil Co., and Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev.
C. (2) Measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands oil question.
E. (8) \$3.25; (9) \$3.25.
- A. George Y. Wheeler 2d, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.
E. (7) \$13.50.
- A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carrier Conference, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Proposed legislation pertaining to the investigation of domestic land and water transportation under Senate Resolution 50 or to the Motor Carrier Act.
D. (3) \$3,000.
E. (8) \$11.70; (9) \$11.70.
- A. Clem Whitaker, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance; S. 337, H. R. 54, H. R. 274, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, S. 401, S. 1140.
D. (6) \$3,137.50.
E. (7) \$157.03; (8) \$15.57; (9) \$172.60; (15).¹
- A. Leone Baxter Whitaker, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance; S. 337, H. R. 54, H. R. 274, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, S. 401, S. 1140.
D. (6) \$3,137.50.
E. (7) \$157.03; (8) \$15.57; (9) \$172.60; (15).¹
- A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting cotton and foreign trade, such as MSA, CCC, commodity futures exchanges, and price control.
D. (6) \$250.
E. (6) \$6.62; (9) \$6.62.
- A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.
D. (6) \$3,124.98.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

² The income of Wayne Weishaar was erroneously reported in the RECORD for the fourth quarter, 1951, as \$13,200 instead of \$3,300.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) \$31.24; (4) \$15.41; (5) \$14.94; (6) \$1.76; (7) \$7.79; (9) \$71.14.

A. Albert V. Whitehall, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ability of hospitals to render good care or which may affect hospital care for the American people.

D. (6) \$1,812.51.

E. (7) \$174.12; (9) \$174.12.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the natural-gas industry.

D. (6) \$750.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.

B. American Mutual Alliance, 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting mutual fire and casualty insurance companies; including, for example, Federal tax legislation and war damage insurance legislation.

D. (6) \$888.15.

E. (2) \$400; (5) \$173.55; (6) \$35.25; (7) \$212.10; (8) \$67.25; (9) \$888.15; (15)¹

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, Fort Duchesne, Utah, and Ignacio, Colo.

C. (2) In accordance with the stipulation between the tribe and the Government, entered in Court of Claims case No. 47565, a cash judgment will be paid to the Ute Tribe in the event Congress does not, during the Eighty-second Congress, enact legislation to return certain lands to the Ute Tribe, we are interested in having such legislation enacted, although no bill has as yet been introduced.

E. (2) \$2.15; (9) \$2.15.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Indians of California, care of Clyde F. Thompson, post-office box 901, Redding, Calif.

C. (2) Registrants are interested in enactment of H. R. 3979.

E. (2) \$10.22; (9) \$10.22.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

C. (2) The Menominee Tribe is interested in all legislation relating to Indian affairs; currently favoring enactment of H. R. 264, S. 1396, and H. R. 7104, and is opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and S. 2167.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) \$9.13; (6) \$5.27; (7) \$26.01; (9) \$40.41.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 5557, a bill for the relief of Nicholas B. Perry.

E. (2) \$8.61; (8) \$27.75; (9) \$36.36.

A. Franz O. Willenbacher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, etc. (3) The Retired Officer.

D. (6) \$1,800.

E. (7) \$12.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. The National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Patriotic legislation, restriction of immigration, suppression of communism, support American free public schools. (3) Junior American.

D. (6) \$474.10.

E. (4) \$252.50; (6) \$91.03; (7) \$130.57; (9) \$474.10.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare. (3) Informational bulletins and legislative notes published in Journal of American Medical Association.

D. (6) \$3,989.81.

E. (7) \$400.02; (9) \$400.02.

A. J. B. Wilson, McKinley, Wyo.

B. Wyoming Wool Growers Association.

C. (2) All legislation in any way affecting domestic wool-growing industry such as tariff legislation, agricultural legislation, public land legislation, railroad rates, marketing and research legislation, control legislation, etc. (3) Wyoming Wool Grower.

D. (7) \$2,000.

E. (6) \$93.26; (7) \$1,050.30; (8) \$47.60; (9) \$1,191.16.

A. Robert J. Wilson, 2003 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Washington Restaurant Association, 2003 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. National Restaurant Association, 8 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Rufus H. Wilson, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Veterans' legislation, UMT, Reserve legislation, general welfare and Americanism programs. (3) National AMVET.

A. Everett T. Winter, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conserva-

tion; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

D. (6) \$2,500.

E. (7) \$958.82 (see attached);¹ (9) \$958.82.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Society is interested in legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.

D.¹

A. Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting business.

D. (7) \$272.50.

E. (2) \$75; (3) \$43.38; (6) \$19.10; (9) \$137.48; (16) \$75, January 5 for December, February 6 for January, March 12 for February, Loretta Jonas, 231 West Wisconsin Avenue., Milwaukee, stenographic service; \$43.38, February 6, 1952, National Associated Businessmen, Washington, D. C., contribution; \$19.10, March 12, 1952, Wisconsin Telephone Co., telephone.

A. F. B. Wise, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Renderers Association, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation on production, consumption, import, export, or taxation of any animal or vegetable fat or oil as well as all general legislation affecting business, particularly small business.

A. Harley Z. Wooden.

B. The International Council for Exceptional Children (a department of the National Education Association), 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the exceptional, such as S. 1463, a bill to enable the States to provide for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes. (3) Exceptional Children.

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.

B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.

C. (2) General legislation affecting Texas railroads. For S. 1657, air mail subsidy separation; H. R. 4483, to amend section 307 (d) of ICC Act; S. 719, clarifying Robinson-Patman Act; S. 2349, S. 2351, S. 2355, S. 2357, S. 2358, S. 2359, S. 2361, S. 2362, S. 2365, S. 2518, S. 2519, all amending the ICC Act. Opposed House Joint Resolution 2 and Senate Joint Resolution 27, St. Lawrence seaway; H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend railroad unemployment insurance; H. R. 1998 and S. 2356, making mandatory certain communication systems.

D. (6) \$5,665.86.

E. (6) \$88.73; (7) \$1,485.99; (9) \$1,574.72; (15) \$18.47, January 15, Austin Hotel, Austin, Tex., hotel expense; \$63.37, January 16, Missouri Pacific Railway Co., Houston, Tex., pullman; \$125.92, January 26, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., hotel expense; \$141.31, February 2, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., hotel expense, etc.¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting oil and gas operations. Specifically interested at present in war power legislation and proposed legislation affecting disposal of submerged lands.

E. (6) \$143.85; (7) \$849.26; (8) \$377.21; (9) \$1,370.32; (15) \$34.28, January 15, 1952, Esso Standard Oil Co., Baltimore, Md., oil and gasoline bill; \$35.44, January 17, 1952, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia, Arlington, Va., telephone services; \$24.97, January 24, 1952, Emerson & Orme, Inc., Washington, D. C., automobile repairs; \$17.33, January 16, 1952, Railway Express Agency, Washington, D. C., air express charges, etc.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; Federal Food and Drug Act amendment; repeal of resale price maintenance; antitrust legislation; education; immigration legislation; Mexican farm labor importation; method for computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; Sugar Act extension; Marketing Facilities Act; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; mutual security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act;

amendment of BIR Code relating to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; postal rates; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; tobacco; peanut oil provision of agricultural legislation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; national farmers day; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriations; appropriation agricultural extension service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; family farm policy review; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service, universal military training; fair-trade pricing study, United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty nations; farm-credit legislation; appropriations for defense.

D. (6) \$2,109.38.

E. (7) \$46.24; (9) \$46.24; (11) \$46.24.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting California wine and brandy industry. (1) S. 2444, Eighty-second Congress, second session: "To prohibit the broadcasting over radio and television of advertisements of distilled spirits for beverage purposes, and for other purposes." (2) H. R. 7337, Eighty-second Congress, second session: "To facilitate wine production, to modify present requirements with respect thereto, and for other purposes." (3) H. R. 7338, Eighty-second Congress, second session: same as H. R. 7337. (4) S. 2594, Eighty-second Congress, second session: "To extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended."

A. Wyatt, Grafton & Grafton, 300 Marion E. Taylor Building, Louisville, Ky.

B. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation, H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951.

D. (6) \$5,500.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2504, emergency unemployment compensation, against. Defense Production Act, continuation, against. Transportation bills (all pending before Senate Interstate Commerce Committee), for and against. H. R. 6174, H. R. 6954, H. R. 4133, H. R. 3391, unemployment compensation, for and against. H. R. 4484, Tidelands Oil, for. H. R. 5505, customs procedure revision, for. Japanese Peace Treaty ratification, for. S. 2444, advertising, against. S. 1310, H. R. 268, mine safety, against. S. 2487, judicial review of Government contracts, for. Senate Resolution 285, Internal Revenue reorganization, for. S. 2639, H. R. 6525, railroad unemployment insurance, against. H. R. 5566, Longshoremen's Act, for. H. R. 5743, Hell's Canyon Dam, against. Foreign aid, for spending limitation. Separation of air-mail subsidies, for.

D. (6) \$1,625.

E. (7) \$353.83; (9) \$353.83.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) \$750.

E. (7) \$14.49; (9) \$14.49; (11) \$14.49.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the Record, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19----- ←	REPORT	<table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">QUARTER</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">1st</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">2d</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">3d</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">4th</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">(Mark one square only)</td> </tr> </table>	QUARTER				P	1st	2d	3d	4th	(Mark one square only)				
QUARTER																
P	1st	2d	3d	4th												
(Mark one square only)																
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT																

NOTE ON ITEM "A"—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated,

place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ←

- A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
C. (2) To aid in the passage of H. R. 1526, 1995, 2273.
- A. Richard H. Akagi, 258 East First Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) (a) To revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes; (b) H. R. 5678 and S. 2550; (c) in favor of these bills. (4) No anticipated expenses. No pay or salary.
- A. Richard H. Akagi, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States (Legislation is a part of this activity.) (a) H. R. 2865. (b) To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917 as amended, S. 865; (c) To revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, S. 2055 and H. R. 5678 and similar bills. (4) \$100 per month.
- A. Kate W. B. Alfriend, 910 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (4) \$500 from February 4 to March 8, 1952.
- A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health. (4) \$20,000 per annum.
- A. Ethel Percy Andrus, 941 Rosemount Road, Glendale, Calif.
B. National Retired Teachers Association.
C. (2) H. R. 2764.
- A. Banks Arendell, 844-46 Insurance Building, Raleigh, N. C.
B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (4) Reimbursement for certain actual expenses only. Only actual expenses paid by the Carolinas (Charlotte) Chapter, National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc.
- A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. ARO, Inc., Box 162, Tullahoma, Tenn.
C. (2) Against rider to H. R. 7391, defense appropriations bill.
- A. ARO, Inc., Box 162, Tullahoma, Tenn.
C. (2) Against rider to H. R. 7391, defense appropriations bill.
- A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health. (4) Fee of \$3,600 per annum, plus direct expenses of travel and incidentals.
- A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting physicians and surgeons. (3) Monthly News Letter and a mimeographed bulletin. (4) About \$1,500 per quarter for printing and mailing.
- A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31, Avenue Pier-fer de Serbie Paris 16e, France.
C. (2) General interest in all matters affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc. Specific interest in supporting S. 2104, bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and in opposing Ives amendment to S. 2645, to extend section 104. (4) (See separate registration of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball.)
- A. Fowler W. Barker, secretary of association (see below).
B. Association of Professional Photogrammetrists, 17 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. (see brochure attached).¹
C. (2) No legislative interests at present, except to get invoked section 251, paragraph 9 of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, for photogrammetric map-making contractors to Government. (4) Estimated \$50 for legislative effort; \$1,000 a month compensation to A above—see inside cover of brochure¹ for objectives; expenses \$1,700 a month, including travel.
- A. C. Jasper Bell, 904 Bryant Building, Kansas City, Mo.
B. Oil Seed Products, Post Office Box 3500, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Seeking enactment of H. R. 6292. (4) Anticipate no expenses except my normal living expenses which I expect to be paid by myself. My compensation is \$6,000 per month or major portion thereof during term of employment.
- A. Frank C. Biggs, 3023 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. J. H. Rose Truck Line, Inc., 3804 Jensen Drive, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) General interest extends to any amendment of Interstate Commerce Act; specific interest in (a) a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; (b) S. 2358; (d) against the bill; (e) for the confirmation of Hon. Charles D. Mahaffie as member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. (4) Annual compensation \$6,000 for all services—legislative and nonlegislative.
- A. John H. Bivins, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. See explanatory statement.¹
- A. Loring M. Black, 2801 Quebec Street, Washington, D. C.
B. William Henry Lyster, R. F. D. 2, Hicksville, Long Island, N. Y.
C. (2) As lawyer for William Henry Lyster, who desires relief by legislation under immigration laws; bill not yet introduced. (4) Expenses not over \$100; \$250 retainer; \$500 on introduction of bill; \$1,750 on enactment into law to attorney.
- A. William D. Blatner, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Associated Retail Confectioners of the United States.
C. (4) Secretary's salary, \$8,400, annual salary. Only a small, undetermined part, if any, can be construed as expenses for purpose of influencing legislation because legislative activities are irregular and infrequent.
- A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks; War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951; S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, and S. 1848, and similar bills in House
- of Representatives. No position for or against this legislation. (4) Expenses will be for professional employment of attorney at law.
- A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
C. (4) \$4,000 annually.
- A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) See appended statement, page 5.¹ (4) (a) Year; (b) \$7,000; (c) indefinite; (d) no specific amount—all traveling and incidental expenses.
- A. Carl Byoir and Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Tile Council of America, 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interest lies in matters affecting import and export duties. (4) See attachment.¹
- A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (4) No special funds are set aside for this work.
- A. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
B. U. S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (4) No special funds are set aside for this work.
- A. Dwight L. Casey, 801 Sunnyside Avenue, Charlotte, N. C.
B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (4) Reimbursement for certain actual expenses only. Salary and certain expenses paid by the National Electrical Contractors Association.
- A. Dwight L. Casey, 801 Sunnyside Avenue, Charlotte, N. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (3) Qualified Contractor. (4) Reimbursement for certain actual expenses only. Salary and certain expenses paid by the National Electrical Contractors Association.
- A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The foundation has a general legislative interest in statutes or bills which affect the interests of milk dealers. Its only specific legislative interest at present is the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and any amendments thereto or extensions thereof which may affect the interests of milk dealers. (4) See attached statement.¹
- A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry. Specific legislative interests presently are: Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

U. S. C. 151); Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1001); McFarland bill (S. 658); radio fraud bill (H. R. 2948); copyright bills (H. R. 3589, H. R. 2464); bills to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television (S. 1579, S. J. Res. 76); bills re transmission of gambling information in interstate commerce (S. 1624, S. 2116, S. 1563, S. 1564); bills exempting organized sports from antitrust laws (S. 1526, H. R. 4229-4231); bills to amend section 315 of Communications Act (H. R. 5470, H. R. 7062); resolutions re investigation of radio and television programs (H. Res. 278, H. Res. 520, H. Res. 541, S. Res. 127); bills to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages (S. 2444, H. R. 1514, H. R. 5889); concurrent resolutions to establish election-day holiday (H. Con. Res. 175, H. Con. Res. 176, S. Con. Res. 54); resolutions re televising and broadcasting of congressional committee hearings (H. Res. 62, H. Res. 538, H. Res. 540). (4) Registrant's expenses will be very small and will be primarily for taxi fares and incidentals, normally not exceeding \$25 per month. Annual rate of compensation is \$5,000.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31 Avenue Pierre 4er de Serbie Paris 16e, France. This organization is a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat, a French manufacturers' association, and is concerned with the development of French exports to North America.

C. (2) General interest in all matters affecting imports into the United States: Tariffs, quotas, etc. Specific interest in supporting S. 2104, bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and in opposing Ives amendment to S. 2645, to extend section 104. (4) Estimated expenses: \$500; compensation: to be agreed upon.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, Lighthouse Service, Depot Keeper (retired), 24 Mallow Hill Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Keepers Association, postoffice box 2169, South Portland, Maine.

C. (2) To aid in passage of pending bills H. R. 1526, 1995, and 2273. (3) General work in aiding legislation for the benefit of association. (4) \$15 per day when away from home and expenses aiding in the passage of the above-mentioned bills, for the association.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. William A. Sutherland, First National Bank Building, Atlanta, Ga.

C. (2) H. R. 3168. (4) No expenses. Reasonable remuneration to be agreed upon.

A. Mr. Dice Crane, Klamath Agency, Oreg.

B. Klamath Tribe of Indians.

C. (2) Legislation relating to Indians; interested in enactment of S. 737, S. 738, S. 1174, S. 1322, S. 1386, H. R. 264, H. R. 1632, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3094, H. R. 3095, H. R. 3368, and H. R. 3808.

A. Caresse Crosby, Peace and "Women Against War," 2008 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) UMT (A) S. 2441 (D) against. A peace bond bill; a secretary for peace (an act): world citizenship based on the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; World Center for Women's Organizations for Freedom Through Law.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Arnold Adler, 1011 Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) Amendment of Technical Changes Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to grantors dying after January 1, 1951. (4) Expenses not determined; no daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation to be paid.

A. Lester Dickie, Keshena, Wis., official delegate of Menominee Tribe of Indians.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

C. (2) The Menominee Tribe of Indians has authorized its official delegates to obtain enactment of legislation which will provide for distribution of a portion of the tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to individual members of the tribe and allocate the remainder of the tribal funds for designated purposes indicated by the tribal council. Registrant is concerned with this program and with other legislation affecting Indians or Indian tribes. The Menominee Tribe presently is opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and favors enactment of House Joint Resolution 8, H. R. 264, and H. R. 2495.

A. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (4) Approximately \$10 per month for taxi fares, etc.

A. Doctors for Freedom, suite 23, 2418 Travis, Houston, Tex.

C. (2) To be interested in all legislation and political campaigns. No compensation for services; contributions to be solicited for printing and mailing expense only.

A. Al Dodge, Keshena, Wis., official delegate of Menominee Tribe of Indians.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

C. (2) The Menominee Tribe of Indians has authorized its official delegates to obtain enactment of legislation which will provide for distribution of a portion of the tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to individual members of the tribe and allocate the remainder of the tribal funds for designated purposes indicated by the tribal council. Registrant is concerned with this program and with other legislation affecting Indians or Indian tribes. The Menominee Tribe presently is opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and favors enactment of House Joint Resolution 8, H. R. 264, and H. R. 2495.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 657 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc. (3) Not applicable. (4) See statement attached (p. 3).¹

A. James W. Douthat, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. C.¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John Fossum, Keshena, Wis.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

C. (2) The Menominee Tribe of Indians has authorized its official delegates to obtain enactment of legislation which will provide for distribution of a portion of the tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to individual members of the tribe and allocate the remainder of the tribal funds for designated purposes indicated by the tribal council. Registrant is concerned with this program and with other legislation affecting Indians or Indian tribes. The Menominee Tribe presently is opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and favors enactment of House Joint Resolution 8, H. R. 264, and H. R. 2495.

A. Joseph C. Fitts, suite 1401, 1250 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

B. Heating, Piping and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc., suite 1401, 1250 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

C. (3) Official Bulletin.

A. Herbert H. Fockler, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians, S. 1452, H. R. 5229, H. R. 5195, H. R. 5190, H. R. 5216, H. R. 5227, H. R. 5221, H. R. 5222, H. R. 5311. (3) ALA Washington Newsletter. (4) Annual salary (one-fourth time), \$1,000; estimated expenses for postage, travel, etc. (per quarter), \$50.

A. Samuel W. Gilman, 300 Belmont Avenue, Colonial Terrace, Asbury Park, N. J.

B. The work is being done on behalf of the independent shipping industry of the Free Territory of Trieste and payment therefor is being done by: (1) Luasino Societa di Navigazione; (2) D. Tripovich Societa di Navigazione; (3) Navigazione Generale Gerolmich & Cia; (4) S. A. di Armamento Marittima Oriente; (5) Carlo and Figlio Martinovich; (6) Fratelli Cosulich, all being of the Free Territory of Trieste.

C. (2) The passage of a bill for the sale of 10 Liberty ships by the United States Government to the shipping industry of Free Territory of Trieste. (3) A printed brief pleading Trieste's case is in preparation in the amount of 1,000 copies with a publication date of March 1, 1952, and is printed by Home News Publishing Co., Oakhurst, N. J. (4) The employment will cease about the end of May 1952. The anticipated expenses for traveling and printing will be about \$2,500. The terms of compensation remain unfixed and are presently in the process of negotiation. The payment is contemplated to be in a fixed amount and when it is ascertained a report thereof will be made.

A. Raymond Gittelman, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Pyrotechnics Association, care of Robert V. Moon.

C. (2) Opposition to H. R. 4528 and S. 1700; promotion of H. R. 6722; regulation interstate carriage of fireworks.

A. L. Selim Glick, the Moslem American Citizens Union (proposed), 3858 North Gratz Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Among objects and aims of the Moslem American Citizens Union are "to watchfully serve in defense of the American Constitution and American world prestige, particularly in Islamite matters, and to defend and promote the religion of Islam and the welfare of Moslems under the principle of

freedom and equality for all religious denominations." At this time we specifically advocate a religious equality bill for the drafted personnel of the Armed Forces, until enacted or equality is effected in operation of the Armed Forces. (3) Personal correspondence to Congressmen and others shall be employed to influence public opinion. (4) Nominal from volunteer organizers' own pocket for incidentals of mailing letters and arising matters.

A. Margaret E. Gordon, employee of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 4er de Serbie Paris 16e, France. This organization is a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat, a French manufacturers' association, and is concerned with the development of French exports to North America.

C. (2) General interest in all matters affecting imports into the United States: tariffs, quotas, etc.; specific interest in supporting S. 2104, bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and in opposing Ives amendment to S. 2645 to extend section 104. (4) Estimated expenses (see separate registration of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball); compensation to be paid directly to Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball and not individually (see separate registration of firm).

A. Lloyd B. Gruman, Jr., Suite 1401, 1250 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

B. Heating, Piping, and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc., suite 1401, 1250 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Official Bulletin.

A. Heating, Piping, and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc., suite 1401, 1250 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Official Bulletin.

A. Mrs. Reka Hoff, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Federal aid to education; ECA and point 4 program; qualified equal-rights amendment; strengthening the United Nations; school construction and teachers' pay; independent status to the United States Office of Education; reciprocal trade agreements without peril points. (3) Mimeographed materials on status of current legislation being supported by the association, sent to State legislative program chairmen.

A. Becher A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (4) No special funds are set aside for this work.

A. Sam C. Hyatt, Hyattville, Wyo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the cattle industry. (3) American Cattle Producer, Cow Business, and various booklets. (4) No compensation. Only actual expenses incurred in connection with activities in behalf of the association, part applying to legislative matters.

A. Carl Indergaard, of Belfield, N. Dak.

B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak. Trustees on behalf of former owners of land sold to United States seeking recovery of mineral rights.

C. (2) Will be interested in a bill proposed to be introduced seeking the recovery or right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States; and will contact former owners to secure contributions to support legislation. (3) Circular letter. (4) Undersigned is to receive contingent fee of 2 percent of minerals recovered for the persons who join the trust agreement.

A. Robert L. Irvin, 502 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif.

B. Long Beach Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.

C. (2) Tidelands legislation—supporting S. 940 and H. R. 4484. (4) (a) Monthly; (b) \$800 fee; \$320 office expenses; (c) December 3, 1952; (d) Unknown.

A. Mr. Lyle W. Jones, 1112 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting the pottery industry. (4) The monthly fee is \$833.34. Only long-distance telephone, telegraph, and travel expenses are reimbursable.

A. Robert E. Jones, care of Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Dairy Industry Committee, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the dairy industry—publications such as will keep the dairy industry informed of developments. (4) Expenses—out of pocket expenses while away from home compensation—\$1,000 monthly.

A. Isalah L. Kenen, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Zionist Council.

C. (2) Economic Assistance to the Near East and Israel. (4) \$1,120 per month and expenses.

A. Earle R. Kennedy, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized. (4) (See attached statement.)¹

A. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John Hanson, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak.

C. (2) Will be interested in a bill proposed to be introduced seeking the recovery or right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States. (3) (a) Circular letter with form of acceptance of trust was issued by trustees, addressed to former owners of lands; (b) approximately 1,200 have been distributed; (c) about October 1951; (d) Doherty Printing Co. (4) Trustees are to receive cash out-of-pocket expenses and the contingent fee of 2 percent each of minerals recovered for persons who join the trust agreement.

A. Robert E. Lee, 44 Westbrook Street, South Portland, Maine.

B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Keepers Association, post-office box 2169, South Portland, Maine.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) To aid in passage of H. R. 1526, 1995, 2273. (4) Bookkeeper for association, \$15 per week; \$25 for preparation and distribution of general letters; \$15 per day and expenses while in Washington, D. C., on association business.

A. Herbert Levy, 430 Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland Pharmaceutical Association, Inc., and Baltimore Retail Druggists Association, Inc., 302 West Lombard Street, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) H. R. 5767 and other legislation to enable the States to legalize effectively vertical resale price maintenance of branded commodities.

A. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Advocate the passage of beneficial legislation concerning fair bidding procedures, Federal contracting policies, controls, and subcontracting policies and procedures. (4) For legal fees, meetings, and communications as estimated expenditures of \$12,000 for the year is anticipated.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks; War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951; S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, and S. 1848 and similar bills in House of Representatives; no position for or against this legislation. (4) Professional employment as attorney at law. Compensation fixed by professional standards and based principally on time involved; no advance estimate possible. Will be reimbursed for expenses, which will consist principally of traveling expenses and cannot be estimated in advance.

A. Otto Lowe, University Club, Washington, D. C.

B. National Cannery Association, 1133 Twentieth Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products. (4) Monthly: expenses, \$125; compensation, \$500.

A. McAdams and Associates, Public Relations, 712 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Long Beach, Calif., Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.

C. (2) A public relations program to disseminate information about the States' claims to their tide and submerged lands, bill S. 940 and S. 1988. (4) Compensation: \$3,190 per month for all Washington expenses, including office expenses, staff salaries, and all others pertinent to public-relations operation.

A. Joseph F. Marias, 461 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Philippine Steam Navigation Co., Compania Maritima, both of Manila, Philippine Islands.

C. (2) To provide for rehabilitation of interisland commerce of the Republic of the Philippines by authorizing the Department of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Philippines, S. 2514. I shall work for the passage of this legislation. (4) My expenses shall be paid by employers, consisting of travel, living (hotel, meals), telegrams, cables, stenographic assistance, etc., estimated at \$1,000 per month. As I have represented one of the firms, Compania Maritima, for

over 20 years and have been compensated at no fixed amount but by estimating the amount of work done, which varies, I cannot say, but I expect on a case of this kind I shall receive approximately \$10,000, if successful, and \$5,000 if not. My full time is devoted to this work, necessitating additional costs to me in my San Francisco office.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 920 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Atwood Co., 1303 Lexington Building, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) The employer is interested in an amendment to section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950. No bill has been introduced as yet. (4) (a) Compensation is to be paid for this particular representation. (b) A retainer of \$1,500 plus 20 percent of the tax savings to the employer accomplished by this firm. (c) See answer to (1) above. (d) Ordinary out-of-pocket expenses of lawyers estimated not to exceed \$250.

A. H. R. Miller and J. R. Miller, Suite 417, Elg Building, 8641 Colesville Road, Silver Spring, Md.

B. National Paper Novelties Association, 417 Elg Building, Silver Spring, Md.

C. (2) Opposed to Senate bill 1624 and all similar legislation. For amendment to sections 3285 and 3290 of Internal Revenue Code. Until February 1953. (4) Expenses estimated, \$1,000; compensation estimated, \$5,000.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program of organization.

A. Henry B. Mitchell II, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31 Avenue Pierre 4er de Serbie Paris 16e, France.

C. (2) General interest in all matters affecting imports into the United States, tariffs, quotas, etc. Specific interest in supporting S. 2104, bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and in opposing Ives amendment to S. 2645, to extend section 104. (4) Estimated expenses (see separate registration of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball). Compensation to be paid directly to Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball and not individually (see separate registration of firm).

A. Moss & Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Interested in the Defense Production Act of 1950 (S. 2645) and such other bills as may pertain to economic controls over industry. (4) \$2,500 for the year 1952.

A. Movers Conference of America, corner Sixteenth and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2348, S. 2349, S. 2351, S. 2355, S. 2353, S. 2359, S. 2363, S. 2365, S. 2653. (4) Anticipated expenses will consist solely of printing, postage, and out-of-pocket expenses, such as taxi fares, etc.

A. Rhoads Murphey, 5826 Ipswich Road, Bethesda, Md.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Development of the United Nations into a world federation; international control and reduction of armaments; United

States cooperation in world-wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognized civil liberties; adequate recognition of the rights of conscience. Specific legislation being supported: Lehman omnibus immigration bill; appropriations for the International Children's Emergency Fund; Hill amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20. Specific legislation opposed: Universal military training; McCarran bill (S. 2550). (3) Washington Newsletter of the FCNL.

A. Francis J. Myers, 2026 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. National Foundation for Consumer Credit, Inc., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Regulation W; Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. Act of September 8, 1950, C. 932, 64 Statutes 798, as amended—against.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.

A. National Association of Master Plumbers, 1916 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2907.

A. National Building Granite Quarries Association, Inc., 114 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Percentage Depletion for granite producers. (4) Monthly retainer fee of \$500 with final fee to be determined but not to exceed \$7,500.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health. (4) Fee of \$2,400 per annum, plus direct expense of travel and incidentals.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 830 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Philippine Steam Navigation Co., Compania Maritima, Manila, Philippine Islands.

C. (2) To provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Republic of the Philippines by authorizing the Department of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Philippines (S. 2514). (4) The rate of compensation is a retainer of \$5,000 for legal services and \$10,000 additional for a successful termination of the matter.

A. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety. (4) Office and travel expenses.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc. (4) See statement attached (page 3).¹

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 2097, Lakeland, Fla.

B. U. S. Air Lines, 500 Sixth Avenue, New York City, and Fort Lauderdale, Fla., Air Lines.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) For legislation affecting favorably freight air carriers, and against legislation that would adversely affect them. For certain amendments to S. 436. (4) Compensation \$5,000 per year, payable monthly. This covers legal services as well as legislative. Impossible to estimate exact amount of legislative but probably one-fourth. Reimbursement will be made for actual expenses. Only expenses anticipated: Transportation expenses of undersigned from home to Washington and return and hotel, and small amount of postage and telephone and telegraph. Estimated at \$600.

A. Earl Quale and Arno Wisnes, of Watford City, N. Dak.

B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak. Trustees on behalf of former owners of lands sold to United States seeking recovery of mineral rights.

C. (2) Bill to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States. (4) Undersigned are to receive the contingent fee of 2 percent of minerals recovered for the persons who join in the trust agreement.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 50 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York City; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.

C. (2) Public health. The specific interest is to present the need for adequate appropriations by the Federal Legislature for research in the fields of diseases which kill and disable people. (4) The annual fees are as follows: ACS, \$17,500; UCPA, \$4,000; ARF, \$3,600; NMSS, \$2,400. Estimated annual expenses for office and overhead are \$12,000. Expenses for travel and entertainment (reimbursable) are estimated at \$5,000 per annum.

A. Otie M. Reed, Wyatt Building, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers and dairy product manufacturing concerns. (4) Applicant is to receive annual salary of \$12,000 and reimbursed for actual expenses incurred. This payment covers all work for the association, including such services, if any, as may be rendered in connection with lobbying.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Gerard D. Reilly, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Foremanship Foundation, 512-20 Harries Building, Dayton, Ohio.

C. (2) Provisions relating to supervisors in Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and bills having bearing on such provisions; for example, H. R. 6239, H. R. 6250, and S. 2503. (4) \$5,000, to be paid in monthly installments.

A. George B. Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Advocate the passage of beneficial legislation concerning fair bidding procedures, Federal contracting policies, controls, and subcontracting policies and procedures. (4) Reimbursement for certain

actual expenses only. Salary and certain expenses paid by the National Electrical Contractors' Association.

A. J. H. Rose Truck Line, Inc., 3804 Jensen Drive, Houston, Tex.

C. (2) General interest extends to any amendment of Interstate Commerce Act; specific interest in (a) "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle"; (b) S. 2358; (d) against the bill; (e) for the confirmation of Hon. Charles D. Mahaffie as member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. (4) Annual compensation to attorney, \$6,000 for all services, legislative and nonlegislative.

A. William H. Ryan, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (4) Approximately 5 percent of my time, but not more than 10 percent, will be spent on legislative work. My monthly salary is \$499.98.

A. Ed. D. Schorr, 38 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety. (4) Office and travel expenses. Compensation not determined.

A. Salvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 5012, Navy bill—For. (4) Anticipated expenditures of minor nature. No specific fee involved as this is but a small part of our work for association as public relations council.

A. Salvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.

B. (1) National Association of Retail Grocers, Washington, D. C.; (2) National Association of Food Chains, Washington, D. C.; (3) Cooperative Food Distributors of America, Chicago, Ill.; (4) Super Market Institute, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Principals interested in amendments as yet unformulated to Public Law 96, Eighty-second Congress; Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951. (4) \$4,000 per month.

A. Harry L. Senger, 1539 Larry Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. National Retired Teachers Association.

C. (2) H. R. 2764.

A. Stratton Shartel, 4635 Wyandotte, Kansas City, Mo.

B. Safeway Stores, P. O. Box 660, Oakland, Calif.

C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended in 1951. (4) \$10,000 retainer, no additional compensation while here. Traveling expenses only.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. The Port of New York Authority, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) For S. 2722 (KNOWLAND) to amend Defense Production Act; for S. 2815 (McCARRAN) to amend Federal Airports Act; for H. R. 4484 (WALTER) with respect to submerged lands; against S. J. Res. 20 (O'MAHONEY) with respect to submerged lands. (4) Total annual compensation \$15,000. Legislative activities minor, but compensation cannot be allocated.

A. Lloyd Vernon Stover, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests of American Trucking Association, Inc., include all bills, resolutions, and investigations affecting the trucking industry. (3) Special legislative bulletins; Transport Topics; Truck Beat. (4) Anticipated expenses: nominal, taxi fares, etc. Annual compensation, \$3,600 per annum.

A. Russell J. Taylor, 9170 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Shoe Workers of America, CIO, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All labor legislation. In favor of all bills for the betterment of working conditions and opposed to all that are not in favor of the general welfare of the workers. (4) \$484.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (4) Salary \$10,000 per year, paid semimonthly, as chief administrative officer. Only a small portion of my time will be devoted to legislation. Anticipated expenses \$10 per month.

A. George Thomas Underwood, 402 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Institute of Wholesale Plumbing and Heating Supply Associations, Inc.

C. (2) Defense production controls, taxation, all other legislation affecting the business of members of the American Institute of Wholesale Plumbing and Heating Supply Associations, Inc. (3) National Affairs Bulletin. (4) Annual compensation \$15,000 plus \$5,000 expenses.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 50 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health. (4) Fee of \$4,000 per annum, plus direct expenses of travel and incidentals.

A. U. S. Airlines, Inc., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) For legislation affecting favorably freight air carriers and against legislation that would adversely affect them. For certain amendments to S. 436. (4) To J. Hardin Peterson \$5,000 per year, payable monthly. This covers legal services as well as legislative. Impossible to estimate exact legislative, probably one-fourth; only other expenses are traveling, hotel, and meals; small amount for postage, telegraph, and telephone; estimated \$600.

A. U. S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) There are no bills, statutes, etc., yet introduced in which we have any interest. (4) No special funds are set aside for this work.

A. F. L. Waggoner, 9541 South Seeley Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Aldens, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Current postal-rate bills and any other legislation relating to the postal service. (4) No compensation other than regular salary and reimbursement for expenses, if any.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Henry H. Glassie, and Thomas M. Cooley II, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation forbidding unqualified and inexperienced contractors from undertaking mechanical specialty work on a cost-plus basis and forbidding bid-shopping after award of fixed-price contracts unless the net saving therefrom accrues to the Government. (4) A retainer fee of \$4,250; a monthly retainer of \$750 commencing March 1, 1952, plus such additional payments as may be mutually agreed upon from time to time in the future.

A. Charles F. West, Jr., Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman, including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

A. Julius M. Westheimer, Julius Gutman & Co., Inc., Park Avenue and Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) Against: Fair-trade bills to revive nonsigner clauses, specifically: H. R. 4592, H. R. 4662, H. R. 6925, revised H. R. 6367; for: H. R. 4365, to repeal Fair Trade Enabling Act.

A. Adam Yarmolinsky, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 4er de Serbie Paris 16e, France.

C. (2) General interest in all matters affecting imports into the United States—tariffs, quotas, etc. Specific interest in supporting S. 2104, bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and in opposing Ives amendment to S. 2645, to extend section 104. (4) Estimated expenses: See separate registration of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball.¹

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, May 12, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, mid all the traffic of life's ways, bowing at this daily altar of devotion we would lift our souls into the light of Thy presence. From the framing of laws and the forming of policies holding in their reach the woe or weal of our Nation and of the world, we would turn to an inner sanctuary where the world's angry voices die and Thou alone art real. In these times that try our souls and as we gird the might of the Nation to defend our threatened liberties, and even as we say to aggressive tyranny "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther," we pray that we may take care to strengthen the spiritual foundations of our democracy, knowing that without

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.